

**THE  
MATRIX  
REVEALED  
Volume 1**

**JON RAPPOPORT  
Interviews  
RICHARD BELL**

### **About RICHARD BELL**

Richard Bell, a former stockbroker, floor trader, and financial analyst. Bell (not his real name) is now retired quite comfortably, and looks at the whole money scene at some distance.

He admits that his hands are not entirely clean. In the past, he participated in a number of stock manipulations, and he also managed to divert attention from several companies in which he owned stock. These companies were on the verge of being investigated by reporters and other interested parties.

I first met Bell in 1974, not long after I had taken a roller coaster ride in the commodities market, making a tidy sum in two months and then losing it all in 4 days. He offered a bit of needed sympathy, and then told me I was a rank amateur in these matters and deserved my fate. He was right.

A renegade historian of money, Bell has been a long-time source for me regarding the money cartel.

Bell was an insider who saw much corruption at high levels inside the financial system.

JON RAPPOPORT

**June 1, 2001**

Q: (Jon Rappoport) What is money?

A: (Richard Bell) (laughs) Paper. Money is paper.

Q: And computer entries.

A: Yes, and like paper they can be counterfeited.

Q: Meaning what?

A: Certain people have made up computer entries in banks that really don't exist, even though there are safeguards against this sort of thing.

Q: Are you talking about the Federal Reserve?

A: No. That's considered legal. I'm talking about freelancers.

Q: So, what is money?

A: At first it was receipts. A farmer traded 13 cows for some vegetables, and instead of actually giving the cows to his friend right away, he gave him a slip of paper that said the friend owned the cows. So the friend got a bright idea. He traded that receipt for the cows to someone else for two ploughs.

Q: And that's it?

A: No. Money is a signal that there is competition going on.

Q: What do you mean?

A: If you look at a small society where there is very little competition, its money is non-existent or not very important. When money really starts to take over, people become very interested in IT, not just the goods it can buy. People want money itself. People want the feeling of having money.

Q: And then?

A: And then you get trading in money, or in other instruments which are sort of money, like stocks. The thing that started out as a receipt then became a thing in itself. The stock market is a trading port in which money is bought and sold. Value is the sought-after thing. People trade money to get more value. It becomes pretty abstract, compared with the humble beginnings. Value is the potential of getting more money than you invested. You buy a stock and hope it will go up. Actual ownership in the company that originally issued the stock fades away as an item of concern or interest.

Q: You're talking about speculating.

A: Yes, but more than that. It's a whole culture. If a trillion dollars changes hands every day in the global money markets—where people buy and sell currencies relative to other currencies—like the pound versus the yen—we are now operating on a very abstract level. We have all these people who actually produce nothing. They don't want cows per se, they want an advantage, they want better information, they want to know how to buy and sell the mark versus the dollar and make a profit. It's a chess game, and the stakes can get high.

Q: And money as a sign of competition—what you were just mentioning?

A: In the long run, money means some people have more and some people have less. On the positive side, it means that people are more independent. Individually. It means you have a society where lots of people can compete for lots of pieces of paper. You're not just talking about 20 pieces of acreage where the king owns most of it and everybody else scrambles for the leftovers.

Q: Of course we know about countries where 15 families own most of the land and still there is money in the country.

A: Yes, but it isn't very good money. People realize that that money is mostly out of reach. The money is not traded extensively on the currency markets...it's silly money, because only a few people really have it. This is all relative, of course, because even in the US you can make a case that a lot of the money is in the hands of a relatively small number of people. But that "small" number is much greater than in, say, Nicaragua.

Q: The Rockefellers have a lot of money.

A: Which they originally obtained through cheating, collusion with other people who had money and with governments, and by misrepresenting the quality of the products they were selling, like patent medicines. Also, some of that money came to them from Europe, from European banking interests who wanted to "take back America."

Q: So in a sense the Rockefellers were agents.

A: European agents in America.

Q: For years you have been telling me that stock markets are ruses. Traps.

A: They are. Once a company sells stock, publicly, it opens itself up to a potential takeover. Because its stock can be manipulated.

Q: How?

A: Let's say you own a company. Its stock is selling at 40 dollars a share. Three men decide they want to take over that company. You don't know them. They are total strangers. They don't work for the company. They begin to make an offer for 100,000 shares at 38. Eventually they get those shares at that price. Gradually, they

depress the price of the stock, and they buy all the way down to 30. Now they have a lot of stock and the price is lower.

Q: And this has nothing to do with the actual value of the company?

A: Nothing. This is what I mean by abstract. Your company may be doing very well, or it may be doing badly. It doesn't matter. This is why so-called fundamentals—the picture of what your company is doing and how it is doing—are irrelevant. Even though lots of people invest in the stock market based on fundamentals. They're just shooting in the dark.

Q: So the price is now 30. What happens next?

A: The three men buy in again and take it up a little, up to 34. Now many fools and their brokers think things are turning around. So they buy at 34. Now the three men take it down to 24. The recent buyers, in a panic, sell. When they sell, the three men buy their sells. For every buy there has to be a sell, and vice versa. Eventually, the price settles at 18. It looks bad. Quite bad.

Q: And the people who actually work for my company are feeling rotten.

A: Of course. You, who own the company, are selling some of your own stock too, because you're scared. And you can't quite figure out why the stock has been falling. You are completely taken in by the self-serving myth that if your company is performing well, its stock will be healthy. You begin to take actions, business-wise, that are wrong and unnecessary. Based on what the stock is doing.

Q: But sometimes the stock of a company will fall because the company is doing badly.

A: Yes. But we're talking about your company. The manipulation is not done on all companies that sell stock. It's done when and if certain groups want to make a fortune and also perhaps take over the ownership of a company through owning its stock. It's like shooting ducks in a pond. You don't shoot all the ducks, just the ones you want.

Q: All right. So the stock of my company is now down at 18. From 40.

A: Yes. And things look bad. It hovers around 18 for a month. Maybe 2 months. Maybe 5 months. Maybe longer. During this nothing period, lots of people who hold the stock, who bought it at much higher levels, become discouraged. So they sell. And other people, who bought in at 18 thinking that the stock would go up...they also become discouraged. So they sell too. And all these sells are bought by those 3 men.

Q: So all the stock, or most of it is now in the hands of the 3 men?

A: No. They don't want all of it. They just want enough. But now they do something else. They take it up to 23.

Q: And, again, how is this up and down manipulation done?

A: Simply by offering to buy the stock at a new price. A higher price or a lower price than the stock is now selling. It's selling at 18? So put in a buy order at 20. I'm oversimplifying, but this is basically it. You buy at 20 and the stock goes up from 18 to 20. You offer to buy and buy, at 21, and the stock goes up to 21. And so on, to 23. Now, at 23, there is some excitement. Lots of people and their brokers who are watching this stock say, "It's on the move. Finally. Now is the time. Let's buy."

Q: And they do.

A: Yes.

Q: And then what?

A: Then the 3 men take it down to 17. This is the killer. It's called a shakeout, and it does exactly that. It shakes a lot of holders of the stock out of the tree and they sell in panic and ultimate discouragement. And those 3 men snap up all they can of this, at 17, and now they gather their forces and they take the stock up on a jagged climb that will go all the way to 67. Over a period of time.

Q: Making lots of money.

A: Lots. And in the process becoming the dominant stockholders in the company. And they will then meet you. You, who own the company. Well, you may not meet them, but you will meet their representative. It will all be hidden under several fronts, names of holding groups or whatever. I have been a part of such an operation, several times.

Q: And you won.

A: Of course. I was, you might say, the rep for the 3 men. I helped them engineer the fall and rise of the stock, and then I helped obtain someone else to actually go in there and take over the company. For the 3 men. I was the engineer. I made sure that lots of brokers actually put in the sell and buy orders, I concealed a very simple takeover behind the clouds. I devised ways in which the 3 men were seeming to be a number of different entities that were buying and selling the stock of your company. The 3 men were very well protected.

Q: Once they had taken over the company what did they do?

A: They sold the company for a profit. Or they kept it. It depended.

Q: If they kept it?

A: That was beyond my scope. I was out of it by then. I had moved on.

Q: Is Amazon.com in a situation like this?

A: That is more complex.

Q: How?

A: Several groups created the dot.com bull market. They, through a number of fronts, bought up a great deal of stock in many internet companies, and drove those prices up. All at the same time. It was a boom that was entirely created behind the scenes, and with the help of PR people who fed stories to the press—and essentially created the illusion that the internet had arrived in a big way.

Q: It hasn't?

A: On the level of money buying money, so to speak, it has arrived. Money buys stock. Credit cards buy stock. Stock is a form of money. So money is buying money. And when money buys money, there is the illusion that this really means something. But there are no cows. Not necessarily any cows. Many of these internet companies were really just fragmentary businesses. They had no substance. Their CEOs were just making it up as they went along. They were running heavily in the red. And yet they were spending money they didn't really have on getting bigger. They were buying expensive ads on television.

Q: But some of them have new technology.

A: And some of these groups behind the scenes, who were engineering the whole internet stock boom, wanted that technology, which they would get if they owned the companies.

Q: So inflate the worth of the companies and then crash them and take them over.

A: I see you've learned a few things in the last 25 years.

Q: You're not saying that all the internet companies are bad companies.

A: Of course not. But most of them, a year and a half ago, were selling their stock at prices that were blue sky, pure blue sky.

Q: So "the 3 men" interceded.

A: They had interceded much earlier, and had taken the prices of these stocks way up, and then they crashed the stocks, which was easy to do, because after all many of these companies really were doing badly, and at the right time this was pointed out. They were losing money on the basis of sales of their products. But they had been, all along. From the beginning. It made no difference on the way up, but it was made to seem like the key factor for the crash.

Q: But it wasn't.

A: No. The key factor was that their stocks were being manipulated. On the way up and on the way down. It was an illusion both ways. It had nothing to do with how good the company was, either on the way up or on the way down. That's the hard thing to see, but you have to see it if you want to understand how this works. Once

money becomes abstract, performance means nothing. Here is an analogy. You're playing Monopoly. The board game. Which is based on owning streets and hotels and houses. Then suddenly several of the players begin to buy and sell stock in the houses and the hotels and the streets themselves. And in the course of that buying and selling, it becomes clear that the prices charged for those stocks do not necessarily reflect the rental prices on the streets. Baltic stock is selling higher than Boardwalk stock. What are you going to do about it? What can you do about it? Nothing. And the game is now changed. It's not just Monopoly anymore.

Q: You can quit the game.

A: A sage piece of advice. But all the people who profit from the existence of the stock market, and their press contacts, are going to try to dissuade the public from doing that. George Bush was suggesting that people invest their Social Security money in the stock market. Do you think that was a tip of his hat to friends of his? Who would make millions and perhaps billions if that idea was ever put into effect? Mr. Bush was presenting the premise that the stock market is like any other investment. Like buying land or CDs. As if any person could automatically pour some of his money into the market and turn a profit over the long haul. That is like suggesting you set aside 5% of your income and take it to Las Vegas and bet it at the craps table.

Q: So, many internet companies have been taken over by people who have manipulated their stocks.

A: A number of them, yes. And more will be.

Q: And if the internet is not yet all it's cracked up to be, in terms of a medium of doing business?

A: Let me put it this way. You take over 5 internet companies. Businesses that either sell over the internet or make products that enhance the internet itself in some way. That takes in a lot of diverse technology. Three of those companies are terrible investments. So you sell them at a loss. The fourth company is a maybe. So you hold it for the time being. And the fifth company is loaded with remarkable technology which can be applied to everything from telecommunications to the art of war in the 21st century. You keep that one, and it makes you a fortune. And you own its technology. Owning its technology allows you to control the market in that technology so that no one else can have it and thereby rise to a powerful position in the world economy with it. Therefore you have put up a solid barrier against newcomers who, if they could have that technology—technology they invented—could influence in a major way the balance of real power in the world. That's quite a dividend. And all you really did, in a way, was manipulate stock.

Q: So the stock market that invites such companies to be clients, so to speak, to sell their stock to the public, is like a shill at a carnival.



A: They are drawing in companies with good ideas, new technology, and they are opening the door so that the hounds can attack.

Q: When you worked as a broker, did you know this?

A: It took me about 10 years to figure out what was going on.

Q: What about the Federal Reserve?

A: It is a money machine. It takes and it gives. It creates money. Think of the Federal Reserve as the agents for still more powerful money people, bankers and others. The Fed produces or retracts the money supply. If 100 citizens got together and bought an old building and reinforced it, and hired guards to look after it...well that would be a bank. A place where they could place their cash and valuables. In boxes. In secure compartments. I recommend this. To simplify a bit, that is how I store my money.

Q: The Federal Reserve is not a government agency.

A: It is a private monopoly backed up by the guns and judges and courts and prisons and laws of the government. It operates through a complex series of rules and dodges which are not easy to decipher. The Fed is a dance partner with the government. The government says the Fed can move this way, and the Fed tells the government to move that way. They tell each other what to do, and the resultant dance is not easy to decipher. But when all is said and done, the government defers to the Fed. In truth a strong president could order the Army to move in and arrest the heads of the Fed as co-conspirators in a plot to defraud the government and the people. But such a president would have to live inside a 500-foot-thick steel box for the rest of his life. Not only does the Fed profit from every dollar it creates, it can secretly create money that is off the books.

Q: Off the legal books?

A: Off all the books, legal or otherwise. There are actually no legal books, where the Fed is concerned. Because by the Constitution it is illegal. But even given that, the Fed can and does create money that almost no one knows about. See it this way. If someone granted you the power to inhabit his property, to live there and use everything he owned, and if that person then took a 12-year vacation to Tahiti, could you, if you wanted to, figure out ways to steal some of his possessions? You would have a great deal of time to work out plans and execute them. And once having stolen things, you could sell them or give them to your friends. And if this person who granted you complete rights to his property owned a vast series of computers, could you figure out ways to make entries, to create files, shall we say, in those computers? If something like 50 billion dollars is missing from the Pentagon budget, and if HUD money is also missing, and if defense contractors routinely pad their government contracts for millions and billions of dollars, why should we think that the Federal Reserve, which actually creates money itself, does not also "make mistakes?"

Q: Are you just speculating?

A: No.

Q: You could call this secret inflation of the money supply.

A: You could. But how much money is there in the world? I have seen various estimates, but I don't believe any of them. But suppose you said that there is 50 trillion dollars floating around the world. And then suppose you found a way to create another 5 billion. All at once. Just as a one-time amusing exercise. Would anyone notice? I can tell you they would not. And if they wouldn't, you could do it again.

Q: This isn't chicken feed.

A: No it isn't. Again, once you get to the abstract level, it's a quite different world. There are no cows to count. No ploughs. If the world were one vast city, and it all ran from a central electrical grid, and you tapped into that single grid and drained off enough energy to run a fleet of buses, would your theft show up? Not if you were careful.

Q: But the point is to own the whole grid.

A: From the point of view of the energy cartel, yes. That is their theme. I'm frankly surprised that more of your readers haven't started printing their own money. If I were living in a small community, with no immediate prospects, whatever else I was pursuing in order to become, one day, prosperous, I would do that. I would print my own money and run my own money system. I would bring in as many people as I could that represent the fundamentals of an economy on a small scale. Food growers, health workers, car repair people, people who own water wells, and so on. And I would try to include all of them in the private system of money. To create a de facto economy that would come, over time, closer and closer to being self-sufficient. It is quite legal to print one's own money. As legal as the Federal Reserve is.

Q: Who does the Federal Reserve report to, really? Who are the true bosses?

A: As I say, European money people. Bankers of a very old status. Rothschild, of course. And others. Money drained down a long time ago out of the Vatican, out of royal families, out of the Knights Templar, into the coffers of banks. There is a whole series of fronts involved. At this point in time I would say that entire line would be very hard, if not impossible, to trace. Not merely because of the length of the history, but because the gigantic laundering operation was undertaken with care. These people were not amateurs. They always ached to get away from gold and silver, which were too real, too traceable. They always wanted to have paper currency, and now that has turned into digital symbols. The myth of the "Jewish bankers" was always a farce and a diversion. Certain Jewish banking families became conduits for money that was not in any way "Jewish." The money was coming down from these much higher outlets I've just mentioned. Blaming the Jews

for money crises and so on...that has been, for centuries, a carefully constructed myth to divert attention from the central operation...which was the serial passage of monies through many hands. Jewish banking families bore the brunt of the accusations because they were more visible. And that was purposeful. The higher money people counted on that prejudice against the Jews, so that the public would connect its own prejudice against the Jews with the somewhat visible presence of enormous amounts of money in the hands of Jewish banking families. The accusations would stop there. Mass opinion, which is never very bright, would not bother to question where those bankers actually got their billions from in the first place. It was not from simple loans, believe me. Usury, as it's called, lending money at interest, was not some "Jewish" invention. Widespread usury was a natural and gradual outcome and outgrowth of the abstraction of money itself. Once money had become available to enough people, and once barter had been psychologically superseded by the idea of money as a thing to be desired, loans at interest became the order of the day. The very, very rich have always been fond of hiring agents as fronts for their operations. The kings and queens and the Vatican, the Knights Templar, who became highly wealthy money people in their own right...and then the mercantilists as the Middle Ages died away...these were the towering money figures. They needed agents to deal with their wealth, to invest it, to make it make money, to buy up land and resources and people...The Federal Reserve is the most successful agent in the world right now. But now the Knights Templar no longer exists. Not in its original form. The Vatican still exists. Certain royal families still exist. And several of the original mercantile families of the Renaissance period may still exist. They would be the bosses of the Fed. The Fed would in a real sense report to them, but through other fronts, banking fronts. I am of course oversimplifying the description somewhat, because the Western world is not as simple as it once was. But the money cartel, as you call it and I call it—what I am presenting you is a big piece of that puzzle. It is not the whole puzzle, because you have China and Japan and so many other interests that developed, long ago, largely separate from Europe.

Q: The money machine, globally.

A: Yes, we have spoken about that. The machine is the Club. The global Club which is at work trying to include everyone in global currencies which are traded against one another every day. The machine is trying very hard to expand itself. To include more all the time. To consolidate its overarching banking and financial system, globally. And the machine works on behalf of the controllers of the machine, the relatively few people who run things.

Q: Let me give you a few names. Rockefeller, Agnelli, who owns Fiat and other industries in Italy, Wallenberg, a Bilderberger, who owns a great deal of Swedish industry. The Bush family. The Harriman family.

A: I'll put it this way. None of these people is above the level of agent. Some are higher, some are lower. If I had to rate them in terms of power in the money cartel,

from higher to lower, I'd say Rockefeller, Agnelli, Wallenberg, Bush, Harriman. Just as you put them. Rothschild interests are higher than any of these.

Q: What about the royal family of England?

A: They are beyond the machine. The machine contains all the agents and the functionaries and the workers. The royal family of England is a controller. One of the controllers.

Q: Can the money cartel act completely apart from the other cartels? Apart from the government cartel, the military cartel, the medical cartel, the intelligence cartel, the energy cartel, the media cartel?

A: Yes. But there are limits beyond which it is not comfortable to go. Obviously, there are many crossovers among the cartels at the top. Money and energy have many common interests. Money and military do not keep continuous contact. That sort of thing. All the cartels are creating an overarching system of global control.

Q: We now see an effort to harmonize taxes among nations, especially in Europe.

A: The huge major transnational corporations will pay less taxes. And the load will be transferred to the people. Individuals. By the way, if you want to do something interesting, walk into 5 or 10 banks in your neighborhood, where you don't have an account, and talk to the manager about opening an account and getting a loan. At some point ask about the loan to deposit ratio. Ask the bank how many dollars they can lend out for each dollar on deposit at the bank. Two? Four? Six? Twelve? See what variety of answers you get. See if they will even talk to you about this. Because, of course, if you can lend four dollars for every dollar on deposit, then you are creating money. You have a license to create money.

Q: Let's talk a little more about taxes.

A: If you imagine a society that is isolated from the world, that has a thousand members, you will not see much of a tax structure. But as the government of a large nation becomes more independent from its citizens, the tax structure will grow. Anyone knows that a country can be run entirely on a sales tax. Without income taxes. It can be done. It's now common knowledge among people in the US government, certain important people, that the 16th Amendment to the US Constitution, the one that created the income tax, was never really passed. It was a fraud. They didn't obtain enough state legislatures to pass it. The income tax is nothing more than a form of social control. It exists to make people feel the pinch. It exists to strengthen the power of the government. Look at it this way. If you are a Third World nation, and you are trying to industrialize, you can't do it without loans from the IMF. Those loans are really a form of covert taxation, because you have to pay the money back with interest. You can't do that repayment either, so the power of the IMF over you increases. They can now stipulate many policies you must enforce. Well, that is what happens in the US too, only the loan part is missing. You are paying taxes to the government, because the government is saying, "Without

your income tax, we can't govern. We can't provide the infrastructure which will allow industrialization and technology to expand and maintain themselves." The income tax is a way of saying that the US can't exist without this forced payment of monies to the government. So the government becomes the IMF, in a sense, and it is saying to the people, "You're dead in the water without our help. Our help comes by you making sacrifices, and the biggest sacrifice is the income tax you pay. Pay it, or the country will sink into a swamp." The tax is an invented debt which the people must pay to the government. But there was never even a loan to begin with. No loan created that debt. That debt was entered on the books in a vacuum. The government must make the people feel indebted. That is its mission. With the invention of more and more social programs, with the expansion of Medicare and so on, you impress on people that they have a debt because they are being provided a service. And this strategy can succeed because the government has become further and further removed from the people. War, of course, is the other mechanism. With the two World Wars, the government found a new way to convince everyone that the people's debt was real. The government told the people that a war could not be fought unless the people paid more taxes...and then when the war was over, there was a new enemy, and perpetual cold and hot wars were forwarded, in part, because they justified the continued existence of a state of war which necessitated more taxes.

Q: The war on drugs. The war on cancer. The war on terrorism.

A: These labels are not accidental. Part of these schemes is the perpetuation of a reason for collecting taxes. More taxes. And the more people pay, the less independent they are, the more they rely on the government's view of what is occurring and what is important in the world.

Q: The war on drugs is a fraud, so...

A: So you frighten people about drugs more and more, and you say the war must be expanded, and in order to do that more taxes must be collected. The government is always inventing more reasons to collect more taxes. It is quite illuminating to look at things from this point of view. You begin to understand the actions of the government in a new way. Create a fear. Invent a program to erase that fear. Charge the people money for that program. Make people, therefore, less free and more weak, because they have less money, and then the next invented fear will strike them harder, because they are weaker and less focused and less perceptive. It is a repeating cycle. This is the vortex in to which the people are sucked, and eventually you have a slave state.

Q: The end of freedom.

A: Yes.

Q: Then you come in behind that, as the medical cartel does, inventing new diseases...

A: Which must be paid for—the research into these diseases must be paid for—by more taxes...

Q: And you get weaker and weaker people, especially when you give them toxic drugs.

A: They are paying for those drugs through taxes, because so many of the drugs come down through medical insurance which is paid for by the government. When you hear about free vaccines, that means the government is paying. That means the people are paying.

Q: What economic shape is the US really in right now?

A: It's in very good shape. The same is true for Canada, and for Western Europe.

Q: That's not what we're hearing.

A: What we are hearing is a lie. It is a lie based on money, on the abstraction called money.

Q: How does that work?

A: The stock market, which is accepted falsely as an indicator of economic health, is used to make assessments of an economy. But as I've said, the stock market is a ruse, a trap to achieve changes of ownership in companies and technologies. The stock market is a game. Most people don't really understand this, but you can enter the market with either a buy or a sell. You can sell a stock you don't have, and then later you can buy it. It's like a reversible coat. You can wear it on either side. If you sell a stock you don't have, you are betting it will go down. And if it does, when you finally buy it, the difference between the price at which you first sold it and the price at which you finally buy it is your profit. Now that is just a game. It says nothing about the health of an economy. But if the public is led to believe that the stock market is a true indicator of the health of the economy...then you can use the Dow Jones average to make statements about the country as a whole. A healthy economy is actually...are there many people who are willing to work? Are there many companies that can produce what people need, what people want to buy? Is there infrastructure? Can energy be bought cheaply? These sorts of things.

Q: But energy is priced high now.

A: But it can be bought cheaply, if the producers are not trying to gouge the public. It can be bought cheaply if oil is drilled for where it exists, in the Arctic and in Alaska. It can be bought cheaply if alternatives are potentially available.

Q: Such as hydrogen.

A: Yes. So, in fact, these economies are very healthy. In order to make them "ill," you have to manipulate what is true. You have to tax people into oblivion, you have

to invent wars against drugs, you have to tell people that things are going badly. You have to point to the stock market. This is how you centralize power.

Q: By concealing the true facts.

A: The one thing that every government wants to avoid is this: People awaken to the fact that resources are abundant, labor is abundant, good will is abundant, and infrastructure is abundant. Because if people realize that, they realize that they don't need the government. They realize that in many ways the government is a parasite feeding off the energy of the people. This is our problem today. The energy of the people is being sucked out of them by a parasite.

Q: The stock market is used as a symbol.

A: The government must play hide-and-seek behind the truth. It must erect ideas and symbols that befuddle the people. That make people think they must give more of their energy, their money, to their leaders. Actually, this is a form of ancient secret-society ritual. The leaders, who are bent on obtaining more power—because they think that such power is the key to their salvation or enlightenment or escape from suffering—the leaders make their followers into the fountain of that power. In this ritualistic formation of a secret society, the followers give their allegiance, their loyalty, their money, their possessions to the leaders, because the leaders are telling them it is necessary. On every level, the leaders use that source of energy to sustain and enlarge themselves. It is the vampire mythology, but in an organized form. The vampire is no longer a free-lancer flying around in the night attacking the blood supply of people on a random basis. The basis is now a secret society, and finally the basis is a NATION.

Q: It is organized.

A: Highly organized, with a top-heavy tax structure, with the built-in ability, at the top, to create energy out of nothing. And that energy is money. But on a psychological level, the leaders want more than the ability to create money out of nothing. They want to drain the energy from the people. They want that feeling. To them that is power. It is somewhat like the power some generals feel when their troops, at some distance, are dying. The generals are obtaining energy from that.

Q: My old friend Jack True once did a series of experiments with a small group. For a few minutes, each person in the group became a leader, a god, and everyone else had to pour out his faith and allegiance in some palpable way to the leader. He wanted the people to feel what it could be like to be a tyrant...

A: I'm sure it was instructive. Money has become a form of that total allegiance, that forced adherence. In a real sense, that is what money has become, and that is why many people actually hate money. Because their experience with it, their parents' experience with it, is so negative and so exhausting. The money cartel, when you look back at the entities I mentioned earlier who were, in Europe, at the top, long ago...the money cartel was really founded by people who had discovered

money to be a form of worship given to them by the people. So it is no surprise that this kind of structure has survived.

Q: The vampire.

A: The modern state operating behind a mask.

Q: A mask of humanity.

A: This is why I tell people to print their own money.

Q: Can these local currencies work?

A: You know they can. They do, even if only in a limited way. The people who use them and invent them find, if they do it honestly, a new sense of liberation.

Q: I have written about a system called Ithaca Hours.

A: It works. I know about it.

Q: To forestall a shower of emails, I suggest readers go to a search engine and just type in Ithaca Hours.

A: The old Knights Templar became somewhat corrupted by money. Some of the knights. The royal families of Europe and the Vatican...well, they were already corrupted to a huge degree. And the bankers who served as the agents of these prime forces—they soon became corrupted too. The secret society aspect of money is simply the use of money as obtained energy, as obtained power, taken out of the labor and the misplaced faith of the people. Obtained voluntarily and by force. Behind it all is the feeling that these prime people had, that they could destroy all reality.

Q: What do you mean?

A: Sooner or later people with this kind of power want to destroy everything. They feel that reality is against them, will always be against them, and they want to end it. I am not saying this is logical, or that it is a conscious plan, but this is what the money cartel is facing: its own desire to destroy reality, the world, everything. This is the impulse they must keep in check. This is what they, in their own private innards, have to deal with. They have gone too far in enslaving people. It has really backfired completely on a psychological level, and it backfired long ago. The idea of getting power as the vampire gets it is self-limiting. This is why vampires are usually portrayed as tragic figures. Some people within the money cartel are just aching to crash all financial markets in the world...and not just to buy up all the bargains. They want to see it crash, the whole thing. They see that as the ultimate liberation. The Nazis rode on the back of this. Powerful figures within the money cartel backed the Nazis—and on a subconscious level, they were hoping that the Nazis would eventually kill everything, every institution, every nation, every



tradition. Wipe it all out. I would say this is the real meaning of the term blood money.

Q: I haven't heard you talk like this before.

A: Now that you have these interviews, I can talk at length. I have seen this principle in action for a long time. People within the money cartel who are being kept in check by so-called wiser heads.

Q: Are they being kept in check?

A: Yes. But you can see the...shall we say, lesser signs of the disease all the time. The wrecking of currencies, the billions stolen on a whim, the self-amused manipulation of interest rates. Beyond these things is the drive to say, "I am the god. I am ruler of the one thing that everyone must have. I am the arbiter of the value of value. And I can end that by ending the whole rotten structure." The legend of the hermetic billionaire banker or financial wizard living in his castle, a pallid figure without real life, a manipulator of numbers, his thin fingers, his death-like mask...I could show you many stories and reports of this image down through history...it is based on real truth.

Q: The Howard Hughes story.

A: Yes. But, also, in his case, he was a kind of holdout against the cartel. He was a codeine addict. Given to hallucinations. And the wolves surrounded him and took him down to the ground. But yes, he was an example. He had nowhere to go after awhile. He was suffering from injuries. A plane crash. And he became addicted to painkillers. But his desire for absolute control as a means to feeling power, this grew within him and helped destroy him. On the other hand, if a billionaire really decided to transform the world in a different way, to unleash technologies which are being suppressed...then the myth would crumble. These people like Bill Gates are not what I'm talking about. Their vision is limited. They don't have the courage to go beyond the conventional limits and, for example, retire the energy cartel to its proper place.

Q: And what is the proper place of the energy cartel?

A: (laughs) In the closet. You've been writing about hydrogen power. It is such an obvious wave of the future, and some billionaire—and you've mentioned this—could just decide to back it. And he could bring in his friends too. There is so much that can be done.

Q: Could a few people pull it off? Without getting killed?

A: I have thought about that a great deal. And I think at this point the answer is yes. Because...many groups and even nations are becoming very itchy about the globalist structure. They want to escape. And energy is an escape.

Q: So you see some hope.

A: Of course. The money cartel and the other cartels do not have absolute power. They are in a fight.

Q: Can taxes, overbearing taxes be defeated?

A: Yes. On many levels. For example, if a new form of energy comes into play, it will automatically reduce the power of governments, which rely on oil as a weapon of subduing their populations.

Q: You wouldn't suggest that a new hydrogen power sell its stock on an exchange like NASDAQ.

A: NASDAQ is a black hole. No, I would not suggest that. I would suggest a strong partnership structure instead. A private company with investors it can trust. If that means starting smaller, then do it. NASDAQ is not the stock market of the 21st century. It is the agent of the money cartel. Made, invented, for the purpose of exposing companies and people to outside takeover.

Q: How does the CIA fit into all this?

A: The CIA has scouts that find companies with promising technologies. Then the word is discreetly passed along to certain friends of the Agency, in the private sector. These people buy up these companies and their technologies.

Q: Which may mean crashing these companies first.

A: It may. One cover the CIA uses is actual investment of dollars from the Agency into the companies.

Q: But hydrogen is an ideal fuel, in the sense that it can be produced by large companies or by a few people, anywhere, on a small scale.

A: That's right. And that's one reason it hasn't been introduced into the world. It's very easy to put a tax on gas at the pump. But if four friends in an out of the way place are making hydrogen, and are re-fitting their cars for it...and if many small groups are doing that all over the world, the tax revenues are much harder to collect.

Q: Back to this vampire business...are the very top players in the money cartel carrying out rituals on a conscious basis?

A: I know of a few who are. I'm not talking about blood sacrifices, although I've heard stories of that too. I'm talking about a cult of money, shall we say. A belief that money is a god. That there is some kind of spiritual personification possible that can be invoked in a ceremony, which would bring into existence an entity. An entity that could be worshipped. There are several ways to interpret the meaning of this. I see it as a sort of group psychic power to give birth to an "entity" that is a symbol but attains a more or less real existence for brief periods of time.

Q: And what does this entity do?

A: It offers confirmation that control of money is a proper thing, a proper activity for a few elite people. It is an elitist cult.

Q: Can you say more?

A: The entity does not give direct advice. It seems to offer the power to control more money to the people who worship it.

Q: Why do you say “seems?”

A: Because the entity is being created by the people who invoke it. It is a personified reflection of themselves. These elite people actually believe that they have a magic THING in their hands. Which is money. They have come to believe that money is magic. And therefore, they have a religious belief in it. Just like some people believe gold is magic. You know, “the divine weight,” or “the divine heaviness.” When people have a deep faith, for any reason, in a material thing, like a statue or a tree or the sun, many things are possible. It all depends on the power of the conviction, the depth of the conviction.

Q: So you are saying that the money cartel—

A: No. Some people in the money cartel. Some. A few. I don’t know the numbers. They believe that the power of money to buy, to own, to control others is a magical thing. Like a magic ring. That is what they believe. And of course they also believe that they are the ones who are destined to wield this power, and everyone else is inferior. This is one reason why they teach their children great respect for money, and for the bookkeeping that goes along with it. You know, “You must never be careless and abuse money.” This is akin to certain beliefs in numbers. Not all beliefs in numbers. But some. These people believe that as the ones who are destined to control money they are anointed. They are agents of destiny, of some higher power, and part of the reason they engage in a ceremonial practice is because they want to see some manifestation of that higher power. They want to know it. They want their religion confirmed.

Q: If the Vatican was one of the original great money forces in Europe, then what does that say about the possibly secret religion of the Vatican?

A: An interesting question. My study of this tells me that, from time to time, the changing guard of several inner-core Vatican people who do in fact believe in this religion wax and wane. They exert more or less power, at different times, within the Vatican structure. But, yes, there have been people in that structure who feel that money is theirs to control in this world. That it is their right. Their duty. Just as in the US National Security Agency you will find a few people who have a religious sense all ALL information belongs to them, and that those who oppose this or threaten it are enemies.

Q: Cults.

A: Yes. And one other thing. You always get, around these single-minded people, the obsessed bookkeepers. The people who think the world will fall apart if every single object and piece of paper are not accounted for in writing. It may interest you to know that, if businesses were not required to keep books for tax purposes...we could see something quite different emerge in businesses that are privately owned by a few honest people. A much looser form of record keeping, in which not all monies and expenses are that tightly remembered. This may sound absurd, but in fact every successful business goes through a stage in which the leaders just make a dash for the next level. They to a degree throw caution to the winds. They put on a burst of speed and they take risks. They don't remember or record everything they do. People have called me crazy for saying this, but were it not for taxes, businesses could run this way for much longer periods, and they would make great strides if their actions were smart. You don't have to know where every dollar is all the time. Keeping track of everything is a form of slavery, and the government, as inefficient as it is, is an example of attempting to achieve this slavery. In its tax systems, and in the running of its own departments.

Q: And the money cartel?

A: The money cartel invents money. So they know that such precise record-keeping, while they insist on it at certain levels, is nothing more than a hindrance at the level where the money is being invented. Obviously. They understand this. I'm quite sure, for example, that the Vatican does not have anything approaching complete records on its own wealth. The treasures and art in its basements, much of which was stolen, are not the subject of renewed careful assessments. At the same time, small churches and large churches and schools under that regime are always looking for more money, are often on the edge of difficulty. This is a workable system of control, which has only a partial bookkeeping apparatus. You hoard wealth, you keep hoarding more wealth, you invest part of that wealth in investments you can yourself secretly manipulate in terms of their value, you come down very hard on your subsidiaries and outposts and make them pay essentially what are very high taxes to the central authority, and you yourself pay no taxes to anyone.

###END###

**June 8, 2001**

In the interview dated June 1, 2001, Bell spoke about the corrupt history of money and how it has been linked to several major groups in Europe: royal families, the Vatican, and the Knights Templar (a society of knights originally sponsored by the Vatican)--and how their monies were in essence laundered through banking families in Europe for centuries.

Q: Where shall we start? More history?

A: Let's play a guessing game.

Q: What kind of game?

A: I'll read you a quote. Line by line. You tell me what period of time and what nation it's describing.

Q: Where does the quote come from?

A: A book called...well, if I give you the title it'll give it away. The author of the quote was a man named Breck. The quote was printed in a much later book by Davis Dewey, published in 1934. Dewey was a financial historian.

Q: Okay.

A: Here's the first line. "The annihilation was so complete that barber shops were papered in jest with the bills..."

Q: Bills? Bills showing debt?

A: Not exactly.

Q: Money? Paper money?

A: Yes.

Q: Nazi Germany.

A: No. Here's the next line. "...and the sailors, on returning from their cruises, being paid off in bundles of this worthless money, had suits of clothes made of it, and with characteristic lightheartedness turned their loss into a frolic by parading through the streets in decayed finery which in its better days had passed for thousands of dollars."

Q: Spain.

A: No.

Q: I give up.

A: The United States.

Q: What?

A: In the 1780s. This quote was also printed in a marvelous book called The Miracle on Main Street.

Q: The 1780s?

A: Yes. It took only a few years after the American revolution for the gold currency to be debased completely. By the mad printing of paper money.

Q: I've never heard of this.

A: Most people haven't.

Q: It happened VERY fast.

A: Here are some tracking statistics. On January 14, 1779, 8 paper dollars could buy one gold dollar. On February 3, it was 10 to 1. On April 2, it was 17 to 1. On May 5, it was 24 to 1. On November 17, it was 38 to 1. By January, 1781, it was 100 to 1. In May of 1781 the paper dollars were completely worthless. After that, a paper dollar was sold like a curio. 500 or 1000 of them might get you one gold dollar. Or they might not.

Q: The government tried to force people to accept the money?

A: It did. But chaos reigned. Finally things were brought under control, but never again would paper money be mere receipts for gold. Inflation had won. People everywhere had gone bankrupt. Their paper dollars, which they had earned through their work, had so diminished in value...it's hard to grasp the emotional and material consequences.

Q: How did this inflation happen?

A: The government just went on a printing spree. But in truth it was an attempt by agents of the British crown in America to destroy American money and American society.

Q: As you said last week, money becoming an abstraction...

A: When money is allowed to wander from its actual source, anything can be perpetrated.

Q: Compare this with the inflation under Jimmy Carter in the 1970s.

A: A much lighter example of the same thing. The Federal Reserve essentially lowers the value of money, by printing more and more. And when you couple this with a coordinated effort by the energy cartel to raise oil prices, you get a disaster that affects everyone, that weakens everyone.

Q: This is done on purpose.

A: The out-front story is that it is caused “by the forces of economics” or some such rubbish, but this kind of thing is ALWAYS caused on purpose. In the Carter example, the Federal Reserve and the Trilateral Commission, of which Carter was a member—the Trilaterals had actually put Carter into the White House—these two groups engineered the inflation in order to weaken the US and put it more in line with other nations...

Q: The “great leveling force.”

A: The great globalist agenda at work. That agenda wants every nation to be financially weak. Every nation to be under the rule of a small group of men.

Q: Is this socialism on a global scale?

A: As you have written, names like socialism are just arguing points. Actually, this is power over the many by the few, and dictatorship or oligarchy is a more correct name.

Q: In the case of Carter...

A: Both the Federal Reserve and the Trilateral Commission were strongly influenced by British controllers who were—just as in 1780—continuing their quest for the domination of America.

Q: But it was no longer just Britain.

A: By the 1970s, these British members of the Roundtable Society and the Bilderbergers realized that globalism had to mean control by a relatively few people from different nations who no longer represented ANY nation. For them, the whole idea of a nation was outmoded.

Q: I’m still thinking about 1780 in America.

A: Here is another quote printed in *The Miracle on Main Street*. This one is from Peletiah Webster, who lived in those times and wrote about them: “Paper money polluted the equity of our laws, turned them into engines of oppression, corrupted the justice of our public administration, destroyed the fortunes of thousands who had confidence in it, enervated the trade, husbandry, and manufactures of our country, and went far to destroy the morality of our people.”

Q: The morality?

A: Yes. Because at that point, healthy economic competition turned into a dog-eat-dog struggle for survival, and many people would do anything to keep their heads above water. They would try to pass off shoddy goods, they would steal in various ways, they would cheat their neighbors, they essentially became criminals.

Q: Sounds like our society today.

A: It does. Money itself becomes the thing to be desired above all else. People no longer have trust in the fairness of society, so they splinter off and scheme to take what they can under any guise. This isn't competition. It's organized and unorganized crime.

Q: In *nomorefakenews*, I wrote about the research of a lawyer named Richard Grossman. He uncovered the fact that, in the early days of the American Republic, state legislatures passed laws which governed the activities of corporations. Essentially, a corporation was issued a charter by the state legislature to do business in the state, and if the corporation did harm to citizens in any way, its charter could be immediately revoked by the legislature and it would be kicked out of the state.

A: But when inflation hit in waves, and when people in general therefore became much more fearful and suspicious, those laws governing corporations were gradually corrupted—because it became the order of the day to take whatever you could by any means. Corporate means being one of the avenues of taking. The MORALITY decayed.

Q: Taxes can certainly be viewed as a form of inflation.

A: If you make \$50,000 a year, and that automatically means the government is going to get a certain fraction of that, then in a real sense every dollar you make is worth less. Which is the definition of inflation.

Q: I've often wondered why printing more money means that prices of goods are going to rise. This presupposes some kind of mechanism that causes the first thing to affect the second thing.

A: Yes. In other words, suppose that every seller of goods decided to maintain prices even though there was more money around to spend on those goods. Then you would have a condition which the money cartel does not want. People with extra money in their hands. The answer to your question involves a number of factors, but look at these two factors: First, key industries like oil which are connected to the money cartel DO in fact raise their prices when the money supply is enlarged. The rise in the price of oil automatically forces every business to raise prices, because all those businesses are now paying more for fuel and pass along that increased cost to the consumer. And second, when the money supply is enlarged, if you also get an increase in loan rates, then many people who are in business AND also want to borrow money will pass along the increase in their loan-payback rate to the consumer who buys their goods.

Q: So, more inflation. Money is worth less.

A: Yes. If the rise in prices is greater than the increased number of paper money bills in the hands of people. And with a decline in the morality of doing business, that's what you often get. People in business try to gouge their customers. Here is a quote from George Washington to James Madison in a letter.



Q: What's the year?

A: 1786. "The wheels of government are clogged, and we are descending into the vale of confusion and darkness. No day was ever more clouded than the present. We are fast verging to anarchy and confusion." He was writing about inflation and rising prices, caused basically by the British continuation of the war by other means. Inflation is a domino effect. When certain businesses begin to charge higher prices, other businesses follow suit. And it spirals.

Q: Spell this out again on a smaller scale.

A: Let's say you have a very small community in a valley. There are 1000 people and 12 businesses. They print their own money. Prices and the money supply are very stable. And then one day, the man at the money printing press starts running off lots and lots of bills, and he passes these bills over to the bank. And the bank starts lending out the new money at attractive interest rates. Pretty soon everybody in the valley knows that, for no apparent reason, the money supply has just expanded. And so they all go to the bank and borrow the new money, just to get some. But every one of the 12 businesses in the valley holds the line on prices. No one raises prices or wages. Everyone holds his breath. However, in a few days two businesses, key businesses like food growing and fuel raise prices for their goods. What is that going to do?

Q: It's going to draw on people's money. Now they have to pay more for what they must have.

A: And then? Other businesses are going to react. They are going to raise their prices too, because those people eat food and use fuel too. So they are going to charge more for THEIR goods. Pretty soon prices on everything are up.

Q: But there is more money around too, to pay for the goods at higher prices.

A: Yes. That's true.

Q: So what is the real problem?

A: You are treating this situation as something rational when it isn't. It's more like a contagious fever. Like a mob reaction. You don't get a naturally escalating spiral. It goes out of control, until finally you need a wheelbarrel full of paper money to buy a loaf of bread. And what if the bank in town suddenly calls in all its loans? What if the bank changes the interest rates on those loans? Raises them.

Q: Is there a manipulation factor here too?

A: Yes, there is. Behind the smokescreen of the hysteria, as the spiral goes out of control, the banks are calling in loans. THAT'S manipulation. And the generalized destruction of faith in the money system to begin with, which is achieved by printing more and more money...that's manipulation from the beginning.

Q: It's a form of terrorism.

A: Terrorism makes people do irrational things. People hoard goods. The supply of goods seems to dwindle. It does dwindle because the farmer is not selling as much produce anymore. He's keeping it for himself and his family. He's afraid. So there are shortages. This inflicted inflation spins in many different directions.

Q: So inflating the money supply pulls a trigger and then other things happen.

A: Yes. Some planned things happen to add to the bonfire, to make the situation worse, and some unplanned things which also add to the fire.

Q: What do you suggest people invest in now? Today?

A: Land.

Q: That's it?

A: That's the best thing.

Q: What is the origin of taxes?

A: The best way to answer that is to say that the further back in time we go, the more we see societies which are theocracies. Some organized religious group has a hold on the society. Runs it. The priests are the tax collectors. They invent the idea of taxes.

Q: There is the Old Testament story of Joseph and the Egyptians.

A: The Pharaoh is facing ruin. There is famine in the land. The people are rebelling. Joseph, as his advisor, sees that the Pharaoh has been taking wheat from the people—which is really a tax—and is storing it. Joseph suggests the expansion of this practice. Or perhaps he suggested it in the first place. This whole process escalates, with Joseph's advice, to the point where the Pharaoh owns everything in the country by dint of a tax, and finally he takes the citizens themselves—their persons, their bodies, their freedom—as another tax against the days when he will have to unload the storehouses and pass out more and more wheat to stave off the ongoing famine. This is taxation to the hilt. It is taking from the people to pay the people back. Wheat from the people, and then wheat back to the people, only now the people are destitute and they are slaves.

Q: Priests as tax collectors.

A: Yes. This is what you see as you go back in time. In every case the religion, as an organization, is tyrannical. It may say it is about God, but the ORGANIZATION is about repression.

Q: This is like saying God wants a tax.

A: It is exactly like that. The organization takes the idea of God and uses it for its own ends, as the ultimate justification for the tax. When of course the idea of God has nothing to do with collecting taxes.

Q: And what about the use of this collected money?

A: The priests in Egypt, in Babylonia, in Sumer, wherever you look, concoct ways to convince the people that this money is being used for their own good. In wars against enemies, for example. Or to build shrines and temples—which turn out to be mostly for the benefit of the priests' power. But there is always a portion of the taxes which is kept and hidden—and then you get into what we now call money laundering. The money has to be passed on to SOMEONE, to use, to lend, or to spend. So that more money can be made. This becomes an art.

Q: Enter the bankers as agents.

A: Yes, and other strategies. One problem faced by older societies was, how do you get some of wealth out of the country—which is the other side of the coin of the question, how can foreign lands be conquered? If you look at ancient Egypt, what happened to all its wealth? Aside from stories of buried treasures, it appears that most of the material wealth was retained inside the society and in a way perished with the end of the dynasties...it was used up, it was decimated in wars, it was part of what went into the building of the pyramids, and so on. In Europe, colonization was financed by royal families who wanted some of their wealth to be laundered into other countries...and that has succeeded through a complex string of agents and cutouts...and results today in what we would foreign investment in, say, the US or Canada or Mexico.

Q: So, if you could track, say, the British ownership of certain skyscrapers in New York all the way back, you might come to the royal lineage of England very, very long ago.

A: Yes. That's right. The continuation of money taken in taxes and tributes from the people all the way down to the modern ownership of structures and businesses now. Of course that money is mixed in with other wealth obtained, for example, from the vector of the East India Trading Company, which was supported by the Crown.

Q: We have spoken before about money as a substitute for freedom.

A: Money can be a very good thing, make no mistake about it. But when morality declines, when inflation sets in, when taxes become oppressive, the citizens of a country begin to believe that true freedom is a thing that cannot be supported. A fracturing of the human mind and desire happens. People come to believe that money is the only thing to pursue because it is the most reliable substitute for freedom. And then you have cheating and lying and stealing and deceiving happening at every level.

Q: So then, what is freedom?

A: It is a possibility of choosing exactly what one wants to do in life. As long as doing it does not interfere with another person's freedom. As long as doing it does not harm another person. That is a definition that can apply to an individual and to the society as a whole. That is the basis for the creation of the United States of America.

Q: But that went wrong?

A: Culturally, yes. People began to believe that freedom was too risky, too chancy, that in a society where money was unreliable, where government could pervert the meaning of VALUE, material value, the best response was to pervert moral value. To leave pure freedom behind and pursue an accumulation of money. People now think that money IS freedom. Which is false. Freedom is the perception of an arena in which one can choose to do exactly what he wants to do.

Q: Of course money can help a person have greater access to what he wants to do.

A: In a sense, yes. But at the core, money is not freedom. Just as fuel is not the same thing as driving a car. Fuel helps the car to go, but driving a car is an action. At the core, a person does not need money in order to decide what he wants to do, and he does not need money to start doing it. And if a person's judgment is clouded, and he thinks that money is freedom, chances are great that he will not do what he really wants to in life. He will do something else.

Q: And if this is a general disease, then the whole basis of the US is perverted.

A: That is true. In an inflated and overtaxed society, money is being taken away from people. Those people then realize that they are being robbed and they begin to calculate how they can get back what is rightfully theirs. All that is good and it is proper. But at the same time, this state of affairs throws many people off. They begin to believe that getting back what is theirs and more, in order to protect themselves, is really the whole key to what they want to do in life. Now THAT is something a little different. That is playing a tune that is not exactly the tune you wanted to play.

Q: Give me an example of a way in which the US government launders money.

A: There are so many. But this is an interesting one. Take a government pension fund. Government employees pay into it, and then at retirement they are given a stipend. But what does the government do with that money while it sits in the fund? The government invests it. To make more money. And does the profit from those investments go entirely into paying off employees who have put money into the fund and to the people who work for the fund itself? I think not. It is clear that there is extra money here. Estimates of how much vary—but it is a great deal of money. The government now has a profit.

Q: Yet the government is not a business.

A: Correct. So that money needs to be hidden. And money can be hidden in more ways than a squirrel can hide nuts. It can, for example, be diverted into secret accounts for particular individuals. In order to make this whole enterprise work, one needs to keep several sets of books. But doing that is as old as the pyramids.

Q: In the past you have said that the creation of the United States was, to a surprising degree, about money.

A: There were several groups involved, and if I give you a brief explanation of them, you will see how money was a theme.

Q: The Knights Templar again?

A: Yes. That group, which started out as representatives of the Roman Pope, became very wealthy in Europe. They started a banking business and a loan business, and they got the support of many wealthy families. But they were also using money directly given to them by the Church. This, in a sense, was an investment by the Church, in order to make more money. And it worked. But there was a falling out. Philip, the king of France, was in great debt to the Templars. So he and the Pope agreed that the Templars, which had become quite independent from the Church, should be detained and tortured and convicted of heresy...

Q: Some Templars escaped from this inquisition.

A: Many did, and they fled to Spain and Scotland and England, and there they eventually set up a new group to conceal their identity. The best evidence is that that group was Masonry. That was the actual beginning of Masonry. Over the next several centuries, these lodges expanded, and they became discussion groups for some of the smartest men of the upper and emerging middle classes. They discussed freedom, political and economic and religious freedom...and finally in 1616 in a pub in London, they announced their existence.

Q: Why then?

A: Because they felt they could survive without oppression at that point.

Q: What about the Illuminati?

A: That group was officially created in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt, and it had ultimately the goal of abolishing all private property...you can trace the eventual development of Communism from that point. This secret society infiltrated and created various Masonic lodges of its own as a cover for its activities, and also to gain prestige with people who admired the Masons.

Q: So there was a split in Masonry.

A: Several splits. On the one hand, you had groups who wanted freedom on all levels for the people. On the other hand, you had groups who wanted all property to fall into the hands of a few men. Even though this idea of no private property was promoted as a coming paradise on Earth in which all wealth would be shared.

Q: That was the cover story.

A: Yes. When you look at the major documents that founded the American republic, you notice that the overwhelming majority of these men, these signers, were Masons.

Q: But which Masons?

A: That's the big question. What you had was a revolution within a revolution. On the outside, you had Masons who were merely seeking independence from the British crown so that they could expand their elite agenda of "owning everything" on the American continent. These were the people who were, consciously and unconsciously, following the agenda of the Illuminati. Ownership of everything by the few.

Q: This was the outer revolution?

A: Yes. The inner revolution was being made by those few men who were more in line with the best thinking of the best of the Knights Templar, who had become the best of the Masons. They wanted true freedom, and their revolution was in getting that freedom written into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Q: And the money?

A: It was coming into America from several sources. America, you could say, was the place to invest or launder some quite old money. First, there was money coming into America through agents of the Vatican. The Vatican wanted to buy land and control land. As usual. It wanted a strong religious foothold in America. It wanted political power.

Q: This was not Knights Templar money.

A: No, no. Entirely separate. The Templar money, which had passed into Mason money, came into America through two major channels. Those Masons who wanted to buy up and own land and farming enterprises and many businesses, as a route to literally owning the country. That was basically Illuminati money. And then you had Templar money which had become Mason money which was destined for a different purpose—the founding of a true Republic. This was actual philosophic money, which is a strange thing to contemplate, but that's what it was. This money, and the people who controlled it, had a mind to eliminate all slavery in America as soon as possible, and to establish real freedom. Their concept of America was a land in which every person could become a kind of sovereign, could create any sort of community as long as nothing he did infringed on the freedom of other people. This

was a quite wide-ranging idea of freedom—much more wide-ranging than the concept of freedom which exists today.

Q: And then of course you had money coming into America from the British Crown.

A: You did. This money was aimed at subduing the population and keeping America as a huge series of highly profitable and highly taxed colonies.

Q: So America was a major target.

A: It was considered the ideal place by all of these interests, each with its own agenda and its own money.

Q: And which money won?

A: That remains to be seen. What I call Illuminati money and British Crown money are certainly in the vast ascendance—only they have become transformed. They are now, for the most part, a single money.

Q: They have joined forces.

A: And that force is known as globalism. At some point—I would peg the time as 1920, roughly—the Crown and the Illuminati realized that money was global. That control was going to be truly global. And then the whole scene really shifted. The Crown as such and the Illuminati as such began to dissolve into a different kind of controlling structure.

Q: The money cartel.

A: Yes. At that point, it became clear that ideology was nothing more than a changing series of faces invented to draw support from people all over the world. No ideology was considered to be serious. It was all seen as a sham by the controllers. The naked truth was, a few people would run the world of money and the world of people, and everyone else would be forced into line. The devaluation of currencies by various means would be a strike force. Taxes would be a strike force. The constant and somewhat secret official invention of money would be a strike force. Inflation and depression would be a strike force.

Q: And at that point...

A: At that point, a concerted effort was started to convince various royal families and banking families and even the Vatican that their proprietary agendas and their traditions and their egos...it all had to go. It all had to be subsumed under a new, you could say, NEUTRAL, structure.

Q: For the purpose of making slaves.

A: A slave in one country might think he is a Nazi party member, and another slave might think he is a Communist, and another slave might think he is a staunch member of the Republican party in America, or of the Labour party in England. And

so on. But the overall agenda was...do not place importance on the ideology. The ideology is all a sham.

Q: And has that program worked?

A: To a remarkable degree. Even the Vatican has been drawn into it, to an extent. To be a controller in the money cartel, in the expanding globalist structure, you have to pay a price. And that price is giving up your self-centered philosophy or ideology or rationale and admit that it is simply all about power. I can't stress the importance of that enough. This is the key. This is what makes the 21st century different. You bring into a room a dozen men who each have their own baggage, the baggage of some ideas about WHY THEIR form of control must be accepted. And you try to dismantle that and get them all to admit that the common denominator is the desire for naked power over the lives of millions and billions of people. Which has no name and no logic.

Q: I see that attempt as a losing proposition.

A: No doubt on one level it is. A man leaving that room who came in as a Nazi is going to leave as a Nazi. But not altogether. Because he is being educated by his fellow conspirators. For a brief time, they all had their clothes off. They all saw that the desire for power was something they shared...it's like the corrupt policeman finally admitting that he and the criminal are the same under the skin. They just took different routes to the party.

Q: And with globalism, these money cartel people realize that by joining together they can achieve more control.

A: That's the deal maker. The world is now too small to allow renegade pirates to carve out huge territories for themselves. That's why, at the top of the agenda, the cartel wants to bring Japan and China into the fold.

Q: Neither is a done deal?

A: Not yet, although Japan has been softened considerably. These matters are all relative. China is much more aloof. But even there the globalists have made much progress.

Q: At the beginning of this interview, when you read me that quote about inflation, I thought you were talking about Germany—

A: Between the 2 World Wars. Yes. 1916 to 1923. The equivalent of the German federal reserve, the Reichsbank, started printing paper money like mad.

Q: What was the reaction?

A: At first, everyone was thrilled, because everyone had more money. It seemed like the ideal answer. Invent money. But then everything crashed. The head of the Reichsbank was Max Warburg, who was the brother of Paul Warburg. Paul was a



major force in creating the American Federal Reserve and was its governor for a time. This was the money cartel in action. In Germany, it resulted in incredible chaos. The man who was eventually given the job of re-fixing paper currency to gold in Germany, and bringing back some semblance of order, was Hjalmar Schacht. Schacht became a fantastic celebrity. People adored him. So you can imagine his guiding influence on public opinion when he decided to accept the job of economic advisor to Adolph Hitler.

Q: Destroy the currency and then take over a country.

A: It happened in China, in 1949, just before Mao came into power. It happened in Hungary in 1946, before the Communists took over. It's happened in many places.

Q: Just for the record, the awful inflation in America that was launched just after the Revolution...it was squelched by Article 1, Section 10 of the Constitution.

A: Yes it was. But that was temporary, because the wolves saw that things could be done to subvert money in America. You're right. For a long time, with silver and gold as currency, things were put right. But then in 1913 a central bank was established in the US, and things have never been the same again. When you think "central bank," think "money printing press."

Q: And what about the inner cult of worshipping money that you spoke of in the last interview?

A: It is money as a substitute for freedom, on a philosophic and emotional and spiritual level. Those who truly worship money have cast aside the real meaning of freedom...they no longer know what it means. They are materialists in the actual sense of that word. They trust in the paper and they have faith in the abstraction. Their ritual is grounded in deception, the act of convincing people that money is a very real thing and yet can be created out of nothing by the people who want to control the destinies of everyone else. That is not money. They are not talking about money at all. They are talking about a few people inventing in a changeable way, an instantly changeable way, an abstraction which is a substitute for value. That is the action of a hypnotist. Now you see it, now you don't.

Q: It's a kind of art where you paint a picture, and then everyone else has to live inside it.

A: Whereas, art is actually something entirely different. That's a good analogy, actually, because if enough force in the art world—dealers, auction houses, critics, collectors—is exerted on the public, a Picasso which sold yesterday for \$10,000 can suddenly sell for \$1 million today. It's the same painting, and yet people believe its VALUE AS ART has changed. And then if someone can convince this art world that the painting was actually done by a forger in Paris, the painting is worth \$100. Inflation, deflation, in the wink of an eye. In a way, in the art world, all this is understandable—but when this happens to a piece of paper which is a 10-dollar bill...then the controllers are saying, "The work you did yesterday which earned you

this 10 dollars? It wasn't the work you thought it was. It was less work. Or if we decide it, it was more work. We decide."

Q: So in the cult of money, the adherents are worshipping their own power to change value.

A: That is the truth, but these people don't exactly see it in that fashion. They deceive themselves. They want to have it both ways. They want the power to determine value at any given moment, and yet they also want the feeling of adoration for money. As if it is eternal and intrinsic and magical. Something apart. Something objective.

Q: Finally, what is Greenspan's next move?

A: Concerning interest rates? All I can say is this—we have had what people think of as low interest rates for awhile now. We have gotten used to that. If something happens in the next period to make...no, let me put it more simply. If Greenspan, on some pretext or another, were to come forward and suddenly RAISE interest rates, raise them significantly, the psychological effect on the stock markets of the world, such as they are, could be catastrophic. In which case, what we really would be seeing is a planned launch strike against the population of the world. To bring about another depression.

Q: Do you think that quick strike will happen?

A: The money cartel has been quite satisfied to, as you and others like to say, boil the frog slowly. Right now that wisdom is in control. From what I can tell, that continues to be the plan. But I personally do not advise on investing in stocks or commodities or money markets.

Q: Do you personally have investments in those markets?

A: Not since 1983.

###END###

**December 21, 2001**

Q: I may have asked you this before, but I'll do it again. What IS money?

A: Money is, from the cartel point of view, what you suck out of the system and keep for yourself. Money is also what you print up, what you invent out of thin air...and then you suck THAT out of the system and keep it.

Q: So, the money that is invented...it has to go somewhere.

A: Yes. You need a place to launder it, to clean it. The economy IS that place. The place where the controllers temporarily float the invented money...they will recover it later.

Q: The money supply. What can you tell me about that?

A: If you look at some of the large industrial nations like Japan and the US, you will see that the money that is invented, that is entered into the system, is a great deal more than the available money.

Q: What does that mean?

A: It means that right at the beginning, there is theft. The available money supply in circulation cannot explain what happens to huge sums of new money that are created.

Q: Not all new money is entered into the system.

A: Correct. It gets into banks, but then, whoosh, a lot of it is gone.

Q: It's not loaned?

A: It's not ANYTHING. It disappears.

Q: Nice business to be in.

A: Quite nice.

Q: Perhaps you could say a word or two about inflation. I've never understood how it actually works.

A: That's because as an idea it makes no sense at all.

Q: How so?

A: The conventional wisdom is, when too much money is printed, prices of goods rise. There are a number of fallacies in this analysis. First, pretend you're a small businessman. You sell sodas and candy. Now, tell me, how would you know that too much money is being printed? How would you know that you can charge more for a candy bar because people have more money from the new printing? You would have no idea.

Q: Yes. But if I had to spend more for rent, then I might pass that on to my customers by charging more for my candy.

A: No. How does your landlord know he can charge more rent and get it BECAUSE there is more money in circulation?

Q: I don't know.

A: Right. There are many reasons why prices of things go up, but I have to say, after 40 years in the money business, new printed money is one of the least likely reasons.

Q: Yes, this whole money thing is very weird.

A: It certainly is. Especially when money is stolen at the moment of its being invented. Most models of inflation are based on a small model idea of an economy. For example, let's say that 500 people have their own private money. Paper money. A little of it is given to each one of them hot off the printing press. Then, a year later, the owner or printer of this money suddenly prints up 500 million bills and divides them up and gives them all out to the 500 people. Equally. In about ten minutes, all 500 of those people are going to know that a lot more money is in circulation. Then some odd things may happen. The dentist in the 500-group may charge a thousand dollars to clean your teeth. MAYBE. But in the US, this kind of universal feel for the money supply is zero.

Q: Do interest rates on loans fit in here somewhere?

A: You would think so, listening to the pundits. But...let's say that tomorrow 30 billion dollars is injected into the system in the US. What does that do to interest rates? Does it raise them at the bank? Does it lower them? Are these changes in rates tip-offs to the nation at large that the money supply has gotten larger or smaller? Not necessarily. The Fed raises or lowers interest rates for a variety of reasons. The stock market plunges. So the interest rates are lowered, as a supposed "stimulus" to the economy.

Q: In other words, this whole money game is very arbitrary and capricious.

A: If by arbitrary you mean that the big boys make more money. Yes.

Q: Let's get back to this stolen money business.

A: I know it's hard for some people to accept, but at the outset, at the point where new money is introduced into the system, there is theft. Major theft. That money goes into banks and some of it disappears. It's negotiable currency, but it escapes the system and a few people get their hands on it.

Q: Completely outrageous.

A: This is why it's so hard to get accurate figures on the money supply. The real supply. The theft has to be hidden.

Q: Yet it makes sense.

A: Of course it does. If you're dealing in hundreds of billions and even trillions, and if you allow a series of private banks to get into the act, what else would you expect? Money, numbers, computer entries—these can all be made so complex it takes a great deal of research to ferret out the truth.

Q: Which brings us back to the first question. What is money?

A: Let's look at it this way. What is the real value here? What is valuable? Well, to you, to anyone, what is valuable is what you WANT. The delusion is, you want money. That's wrong. You don't want money. You want what you want out of life. You see? If you don't know what you really want, if you've never defined this, then you want money, because you know at some future point you can decide what you want and buy it with the money. I'm not just playing word games here. This is important. To get out of the system you need to do a number of things. But the first thing is, you have to figure out what you want. You want a house in the mountains, a big picture window, a farm? Then you focus on that, and the power of money over you lessens. The whole money game, the phony game, is built on you believing that money IS the FIRST and best thing you want.

Q: You're talking about creating value.

A: I am. You create what is valuable to you. Money is the medium of exchange. Money buys that value, in many cases, but if you just focus on money, you start forgetting what you want.

Q: Keep going.

A: This is a process. You keep going for what you really want, and then at some point, when you're getting some of what you want, you find out that you can now want money. You can feel money, so to speak. You can generate money. But in order to get to that point, the point where you DO want money, you have to start back further, with what you want out of life. Sitting in a room with no money thinking you want money is a bad place to start. It doesn't work. You have to define what you really want. That's the starting point.

Q: What about barter?

A: A time-honored system. It focuses on what people want. You want a new set of tires, you find someone who has them and you see what he wants in return. It's goods for goods. This is a very sobering procedure. Because if you trade something you have for something another person has, and if it turns out you really don't want what you just got...you're disappointed. That teaches you something. Find out what you want and get it. But as time goes on, as this society disintegrates, fewer people

know what they want. That is a prime symptom of a crumbling society. People no longer know what they really want.

Q: When you don't have anything...

A: You imagine all sorts of things you might want. The funny thing is, when you get them, you often realize they aren't what you want. They were just off-hand dreams you dreamed because you had to dream about SOMETHING. So this process of finding out what you want, it takes thought. It takes work.

Q: Talk about rampant consumerism.

A: Rampant consumerism is what happens when people don't know what the hell they want. They keep buying stuff, hoping it will satisfy them. But it doesn't. Not really. They fill up their closets and they forget all about what they bought. Why? Because they never really wanted it. However, the solution to that is not some kind of asceticism. You don't solve this by retiring to a cave. You don't solve it by refusing to get anything. You solve it by figuring out what you really want. When I was on the lecture circuit, I tried to hammer this point home.

Q: There are a number of private currencies in the US. Groups print up their own money and use it.

A: Yes, it's very instructive. Say you have 500 people who are in a private currency system. They begin to get some idea of what is for sale, within their system. They begin to pick and choose what they want. Not this, not that, but THIS. It helps define things.

Q: What happens if a person says, I want my own island and a huge mansion and ten cars and a yacht.

A: No problem. If that's what he really wants, he's going to be surprised what happens when he goes for it. You see, now he knows. Now it's real. But it has to be real. It can't be some wispy idea. And then, as the person starts to put together pieces of his dream, he's going to discover other things he wants, and he's going to find ways to get the money to get them. Here is the progression: Find out what you really want; move in the direction of getting it; get part of it; feel better; now you naturally and easily realize that you do want money; money tends to flow to you and you tend to do things that bring in good money; discover new things you really want; move directly toward getting them. And so on. of course, when I say "things," I don't always mean material possessions. What you really want is WHAT YOU REALLY WANT. Only you can figure that out.

Q: What is happening with the EU and the US?

A: As you say, there is a war going on. And at even higher levels, these entities, the corporation called the US and the EU, are being made larger and larger so that, one day, when they are One, they will run a big slice of the world. The feudal system is a

very good model for seeing how this works. Let's say I'm a royal mucky muck and I look out from my castle and I see spread out there lots of little farms and communities and small armies and so on. And I think, this isn't bad. All this land and power is diffused, and I have my own very large army, and I can overwhelm all of them, so I'm the boss. But, on the other hand, to actually go in there and run all these little pockets...that can be a pain in the neck. And suppose one of these independent operations comes up with a new idea. Who knows what. A way to make a faster vehicle to get products to market, or a boat that can sail from the beach to another country...you're never sure what these thorny independents might come up with that would shift the balance of power in an unpredictable way. Meanwhile, I know that my brother-in-law owns a big chunk of land off to the left there, and my cousin also has a large estate and a pretty good army. So I come up with another plan that goes off in a different direction. Privately and separately, I encourage each of my relatives to strengthen his holdings, to expand. To conquer these little operations. Right? I secretly help fund these two strategies, and at the same time, I figure out ways to set these two relatives against each other. To make competitors out of them. This is very easy. Now, down the road five years, the landscape outside my window looks very different. Very few independents. No more checkerboard. Now my two relatives are very strong, very expanded, AND very beholden to me. NOW I become the peacemaker. Under my leadership, I bring them together, with me at the head of the whole deal...of course my holdings and my army and my power were greater than both of them put together...I made sure of that. So now I have a new structure, and I control it.

Q: Now, from the bottom, so to speak...how to defeat this huge juggernaut...

A: There are many ways. You showed me an email from a researcher. It is right on. One way is, you begin to crawl into the crevices of these leaders' private lives, and you come up with their strange actions...you find out that a few of them are pornographers or what have you...and you show this evidence to everyone...I'm talking, as this researcher was, about the really nasty stuff...not just the money theft and the wars they were supporting...the nasty stuff...and it is there, believe me...I saw that in the years I was active on Wall Street...there were quite well-known people who were perverts on a very personal level...and not just ordinary run of the mill perverts...because these men had extraordinary power...they controlled markets...you really want to see gross examples of people who have never known what they really want? Look at these men. They have gotten every material thing anyone could desire, and yet they wind up with nothing, in a very real sense. They are so screwed up they begin to think they have to have sex with children, or something along those lines. That is what they come up with. They are operating in a Twilight Zone of desperation at the same time they are coolly running up markets and running down markets. It's all a sham at a very basic human level. They are seeking vast control of nations and yet they can't get an ounce of real lasting satisfaction from any of this. The EU, the WTO, the IMF, it's all nuts. It means nothing. It's got no true payoff for ANYONE. That's why I got out of the game. I was able to pick stocks as well as anyone. But at night, I was an alcoholic with a pill

problem. I couldn't find any footing. So I got out. And I found that when you start thinking about what you truly, really want, you then, finally, start to hit paydirt. You start to come out of the zombie state. These controllers are zombies. Look at their eyes, their bodies. They are living corpses. They have lost their real vitality.

Q: Go to the movies. Look at every depiction of one of these controllers. Orson Welles as Citizen Kane when he finally becomes an emperor. They become wooden statues.

A: We, actual people, have the answers. We're still alive. We need to make that work for us. I know you've talked about this: There are thousands of inventions out there that could change the balance of power. Engines that run on water, and the like. These people have to get off the mark. They have to stop looking for acknowledgement. They have to go into production and sell their revolutionary devices to people who want them. You see, it keeps coming back to what you really want. Do you want a car that runs on water? Find one. Buy it. Or if you make such a car, sell it. Don't wait around.

Q: There is such a drive in some people to be recognized.

A: And there is nothing wrong with that. But when that turns into waiting around for a Nobel, it's destructive. I know talented people who in their souls are sitting there waiting for a crown to descend on their heads. When they should be selling the products of their talent. You and I have talked about this many times. There are two factors here. Deciding what you truly want and getting it...that's one. The other is, admitting that what you have to offer is worth money. When you finally confess to that, you are on the move. You are doing it. You are in the world. You are discovering that you have work to do. Lots of work.

Q: What about you?

A: Like a lot of people, I got caught in the middle.

Q: What does that mean?

A: For years, I sold stocks. Many of my clients made money. But I found out that what I was selling...I had attached my talents to something that was a ruse. A phony game. I had not done enough homework to see what the bottom lines were. So many people get caught in this. They have talent, but they don't do their homework. They don't see that their talent is hooked up to a losing proposition in the long run. So you have to make sure that the products of your talent are real, are not being used to support a corrupt structure like the stock market. That's why I finally went on the road and talked to people about what I'm saying here. What is success? What is money? What is your life about? What do you want? When you get down to this, you come up with some surprising answers.

Q: You're an optimist.



A: Always was. I couldn't shake it. (laughs) But I'll tell you this. You can't think that what you have to offer is only good if people use it. That's going too far. That's taking the whole human race on your back. To change the subject just a little, this country is becoming obsessed with security. Now, if you start to build your life from that point, you lose. It won't work. Because that is not what you really want. That is not the big thing you desire. Security is necessary and fine, but it is not the goal. If your major plan is how to assure security, you will lose. You have to start way beyond that. If you want to become a runner and the first thing you do is try to get the money to hire 14 guards to make sure the park is secure when you run...well, you see it. You lose. On the other hand, if your dreams are the first thing, then you'll pay attention to security, as you need it. If you want to renovate a neighborhood, you just do it. You get the people together and you do it. Then you think about how to ensure that you can carry on your work in safety. The cartels WANT you to become so obsessed by security that you can't think about anything else. So obsessed you trade your life for security on every level. And when you make an absolute equation between money and security, they've got you. Then you're trapped in the system.

Q: Was there a defining moment for you?

A: October 1987. The day the market collapsed. I had knowledge that this was coming, and I was nervous about it. I wasn't 100 percent sure in my mind. So I gathered together 10 of my clients, and I met with them, in September. I told them what I knew. They all sold short, and they all made a bundle. So did I. Afterwards I thought, what the hell am I doing? What kind of twisted game is this? The crash of course had nothing to do with the health of the economy. It was rigged, just the way it always is. You know, if you were to go to those 10 clients of mine today, the ones who are still alive, and if you were to examine their lives, you'd be very disappointed. They won, and yet they lost. None of them is happy. Because they still don't know what they really want. That may sound crazy to some people, but it's true. When you make money your prime goal, which is what everybody I knew on Wall Street was doing, all you end up with is scams. One scam after another. At first it's exhilarating, and then you wind down and you look around, and you know nothing.

Q: So that was the game.

A: Going from one scam to another, one trick to another. One piece of inside information to another. One way of stealing and hiding money to another.

Q: That was the whole point of the movie Wall Street, wasn't it?

A: Yes, but in reality the game is much more vicious. You are up to your ass in dirty tricks. You are floating disinformation about stocks to hide the real information you have. You're looped in with the government itself, because the government controls huge dollars that go out in contracts to private firms. Those contracts will present a picture of how well a company is going to do, and therefore how well its stock is

going to do. But that's just one level of information, because at a deeper level the stock is being manipulated without any real reference to facts. Facts are used to create the illusion that the stock is valuable, but if you rely too much on that illusion, you are going to get hit with losses at some point. It's a maze, and you try to navigate it. It can be very exciting until you win a big one. Then you step back because you can, and you see that what you just won has little meaning because you're still in the dark about your life, your direction, your self. Most people go into complete lying denial at that point. They're scared. They fall back on relying on a display of wealth. That's all they have. It's a lot better than starving, but in the long run it's ashes. You could take your winnings and fly to Uganda, and you could bring together a group of very poor people, and you could ask them what they would do with that chunk of money. And you know what? They would have much saner answers than you do. It's a travesty. Unless you really know what you really want.

Q: Let's talk about the IMF and the imminent financial collapse of Argentina. [see my piece on that today on [www.nomorefakenews.com](http://www.nomorefakenews.com)]

A: Okay. As I'm sure your readers know by now, the IMF runs controlled destructions of nations. They lend money to governments, impose strictures on those governments which inflame the people, cause riots, and so on. And then the nations are in turmoil, markets fall, everything goes to hell in a handbasket. Wages go into a free fall. Money is devalued. All that sort of thing. Transnational corporations get free rein to come in and rape these nations. It's all planned, it's all a fairly simple scheme. The leaders of the borrowing Third World governments know what's going on. They are paid off in secret bank accounts. They are bought off. You get the destruction of the middle class in a country. The few rich get richer and the masses become much poorer. I could take you through the steps, in tight sequence, but much of that material is already on your website [in past articles].

Q: Yes. Is there anything else?

A: Sure. The false fairy tale goes like this. The poor nations who receive these IMF loans never see it coming. They don't realize the end-game right up the road. The government leaders are paid off and that's that. But there is more. There is more coercion to enter the Venus-fly-trap of the IMF. These poor nations know that if they want to be part of the global economic community, if they want to have their currencies traded on open markets, if they want to be part of trade treaties, if they want to be invited to international conferences...if they want all these things and more, they HAVE to play the IMF game. They have no other choice. They can reject IMF presence for awhile, but not forever. Unless these countries are ready to go it alone, to become entirely self-sufficient nations—which is what they SHOULD be thinking about and doing—they have to play ball. If they want oil, they have to play ball. If they want to trade for food from abroad, they have to accept the IMF scheme. And on top of that, I'm aware of several instances in which government leaders of these countries have been blackmailed.

Q: Blackmailed?

A: Their personal lives are put under a microscope. Their sexual peccadilloes are discovered. They are lured into sexual traps. All sorts of things. The CIA, to name one agency, keeps track of these matters. So the leaders fold up. They go along with the plan to destroy their countries. A big secret Swiss account looks a lot better than exposure in the press as a pervert.

Q: And what is the final result of this sort of IMF OP?

A: Depends on what you mean by final. But in essence, these countries end up being run from remote points outside their borders. They become fake nations. They become fictions. They are no longer nations. They are colonies.

Q: Colonies of whom?

A: Well, on the surface you could say they become colonies of the IMF. But it goes deeper than that. These Third World nations ultimately are run by men within the cartel structure, or, to say the same thing in a different way, by consortiums of very powerful players. We are seeing that develop in Zaire, for example, where consortiums are not only taking over the incredibly rich mineral reserves of the country, but are essentially demanding complete control of the government.

Q: So you could say that these countries are ultimately slated to become private preserves of a few very heavy hitters.

A: That would be accurate, yes.

Q: Now, I have spoken about this with other interviewees. There is a problem here. The people of these nations are very desperate. They have seen their assets disappear. Poverty is widespread, as is illness. For their remote rulers, the REAL rulers, the heavy hitters, that poses a problem. A problem of possible revolution.

A: You bet. And the answer to that is depopulation. The ways of killing off significant segments of the populace. And then, the re-population of the country with people who are much more in line with the transnational companies who set up shop and run the life of the country. You see, from my old vantage point of trading stocks and other instruments, I finally saw the whole picture. For these transnationals to be successful, in the long run, they were going to have to take over countries. These corporations are running on the premise that there is always MORE.

Q: More what?

A: More raw materials, more labor, more automation, more customers to buy their products, more land. These juggernauts can't stand still. Here is one crazy reason why: They need to give the appearance that their stock is more and more valuable. If their production and sales figures stagnate, the people who buy stocks will begin to believe that the company is stalling, is failing, and the stock will tend to fall. Now, this can be corrected by sheer stock manipulation, but at the same time, the

company needs the appearance of rising production/sales figures to give the impression that their stock is gaining in value, is more attractive. I know this sounds completely backwards, but that is how it works. Because the people who run these companies naturally own huge amounts of their own stock. And that stock is money in the bank to them.. The owners are making huge profits, personally, when the stock goes up. The owners, in this mad game of musical chairs, are always looking to bail out, to take their profits and cash in and go somewhere else. See? They are always looking to pass the burden on to someone else, as they exit.

Q: Pretty nasty.

A: Very nasty. So, in a CEO's mind, there is this thought: Take over a few more countries, further inflate the value of the company's stock, and bail. The public tends to think that all those shake-ups at the top of transnational corporate ladders, all those resignations, are just the result of poor performance or aging leaders or whatever. But more often than not, it's simply musical chairs: "Hey, I've got mine, you work the scam for awhile, I'm heading for Switzerland."

Q: Sounds like desperation and fear are at work there too.

A: That's why I say musical chairs. When you're really in the business of taking over countries and impoverishing large numbers of people, and killing off people one way or another to retain control of a country, you know that you're skating on thin ice. You're in a dangerous situation.

Q: So the IMF becomes the method.

A: One method. One front. One cutout. One way to work the play. One group to hide behind.

Q: Then the IMF, although it is owned by the US Treasury Department, is not really the ultimate source of all this insanity.

A: Of course not. The Treasury Department, representing the US government—these are just more fronts. These are just more subsidiaries, you could say, of distinctly PRIVATE interests.

Q: Which private interests?

A: Rockefeller interests. Bush family interests. The modern version of Rothschild interests and Morgan interests and so on. The Bush family is what I would call a striving kid on the block. You know, the one who has a lot of money but not as much as the really big boys. He's trying, though. He hustling every angle he can. He's in a hundred deals with a hundred people. He's fronting for the Carlyle Group, which is buying up defense companies as the son in the White House is fomenting war in Afghanistan and later, in other places—all of which pumps up the value of those defense companies. The Bush kid on the block is a hustler who has ambitions of

being thought of as old money. But he never quite makes it, and that pisses him off, so he tries harder. He doesn't have the right naturally aristocratic arrogance. No matter what he does, the really rich chuckle at him. He can be in the White House, twice, and still he doesn't get the respect he thinks he deserves. He can't make it right. He's [Bush, Sr.] always the water boy for someone. He hates that. He wants more. But he doesn't really know what to do. He's schizoid. He's trying to be a family man who has homespun values and at the same time he's vicious in his desire for revenge. He wants to sit at the main table, but he is not part of that circle.

###END###

**July 5, 2002**

Interview with a former colleague of Richard Bell's.

Margo James (pseudonym) was a former colleague of Richard Bell's. Margo worked on Wall Street as an investment advisor, a broker, and a stock analyst for longer than a decade. Margo left the Street in disgust and outrage, and she's still angry. Margo finally consented to speak to me under the condition that she would avoid certain specific references that would point to her identity. I asked her why she was being so private. "I'm in the process of assisting the possible formation of a class-action investors' suit," she said. "I'm in the very early stages. So I want to shield myself for now."

Q: You were a broker?

A: Yes.

Q: Did you ever feel you were cheating your clients?

A: My whole reason for staying in the business was to give my clients a fair shake. I worked very damn hard at that, and when I no longer felt I could discharge my obligations in that direction, I quit.

Q: What changed you mind about your ability to work in an ethical way?

A: I became convinced I was a front-woman for a gigantic scam.

Q: What scam?

A: It's called the stock market.

Q: That bad, eh?

A: Yes. That bad.

Q: What is the biggest part of that scam?

A: Hard to rate. But consider the NASDAQ bubble that burst a while ago. That was a pretty good one.

Q: What was the scam involved there?

A: Well, what's a person to think when companies are going belly up from A to Z?

Q: But couldn't that be the result of stupidity? Miscalculation?

A: Yeah, and the moon is made of green cheese.

Q: So you are saying this was an OP?

A: I like that word. Yes, that's exactly what I'm saying. It WAS also stupidity and hubris and so on, but it was an OP.

Q: And how was it an OP?

A: Where do you want to start? As I believe Richard Bell has told you, NASDAQ is a trolling operation to find companies with new technology and vulnerability.

Q: Who is doing the trolling?

A: I'll answer that this way. If you find a company which has technology that can possibly change the marketplace in a significant way, wouldn't you want to take it over, if you were a person for whom such control was important? Wouldn't you? NASDAQ is a shooting gallery. The companies are sitting there, hoping that their stock prices will move up and up and up. They are open to takeover, they are open to the kind of decimation that occurs when someone enters the game and takes their stock DOWN. And then buys in on the low. Or walks in the door with money and a plan.

Q: So NASDAQ is there to lay these companies open to that kind of takeover.

A: That's one reason. Yes. Let me tell you a story that takes this one step further. A company [listed on NASDAQ] that makes widgets looks very good. New technology. Small company. On the rise. The CEO is the usual kind of manic fool that believes in manifest destiny for himself. So every new gain in stock price gives him confirmation of his own financial destiny. His ego is gigantic. Three months later, he's on his back on the floor whining and moaning because, somehow, his stock has gone into the South Pole. Almost blown out. He's ready to kill himself. A man makes contact with him and tells him that there is a way out. The man comes to him with solid references—the CEO doesn't know him, but at this point he'll jump at ANYTHING. The man tells the CEO that his company is going to be taken into bankruptcy. There is no way out of that. It's a foregone conclusion. But if the CEO makes certain important concessions RIGHT NOW, he can become a "silent partner" in the new re-organized debt-free version of the company.

Q: Silent partner?

A: So to speak. The CEO will lose his job, but his brand new bank account will look very nice indeed. Very nice. An offshore account.

Q: So essentially the CEO is being asked to betray his own company completely.

A: Yes. That's right. He hands over certain secrets, proprietary technology, and he's back in clover. With enough money to live on for the rest of his life. Never involved in his old company.

Q: This is not a metaphor.

A: Hell no. This is a company whose stock I was selling at one time. I was selling it like mad. I had been ordered to by my bosses.

Q: Why?

A: Because an investment bank which was allied with the firm I worked for had bankrolled this company, and wanted to see its stock go up.

Q: I see. But the stock of this company ultimately tanked.

A: Yes.

Q: So who was playing whom?

A: That's an interesting question, isn't it?

Q: Yeah.

A: The investment bank, in this case, was on the short end of the stick. Some "outside force" considered it was more important to get hold of that proprietary technology than let that investment bank work the stock up to a very high point and keep it there.

Q: And this outside force was, perhaps, somebody with strong military connections, with intel connections?

A: No comment.

Q: And you found out about this OP.

A: It took me the better part of a year. It was NOT easy. But I managed to find out who was depressing the price of this company's stock. I found out who was spreading very corrosive rumors about the company. I found out who was essentially blackmailing the COO of this company. I found out who was buying up the stock on the low end and taking over control of the company. They were all from the same source. They all came from the same basic place. But their operation was compartmentalized. You didn't just waltz from knowing who was spreading rumors to knowing who was pushing the stock price down. This was not easy. I had to work my ass off to get to the facts. There was a lot of smoke.

Q: When you found out what was what, where did you go?

A: First I went to my own boss. I told him a very sanitized version of the story. He acted like a dimwit. "I just don't get what you're implying." "I think you've run off the road with this one." "What are you really saying?"

Q: Did your boss know the truth?



A: He didn't have a clue. I knew he wouldn't. But I just wanted to see his reaction. It was pretty much what I expected. "Keep your nose to the grindstone and don't worry about such things."

Q: Then what did you do?

A: I went over his head to a key person at the investment bank that was backing this technology company we're talking about.

Q: And what happened there?

A: This was tricky. I didn't want to spell all the beans to him. I wanted to get a reaction without going too far. So I took it a step at a time. I gave a little, took in his response, gave him a little more, and so on.

Q: What did he say?

A: Finally, he said to me, "I know what you're talking about in general. I'm aware of the basic kind of situation you're describing. I'm sure you have many more details than I do. We're going to take a pass on this one."

Q: Meaning the bank was going to absorb its losses and move on?

A: Yes.

Q: Because?

A: Because you don't mess with the thirty-foot python.

Q: But normally this bank, to which your brokerage house was attached, would be doing all the manipulation and the hype, in order to inflate the worth of this company whose stock you were promoting.

A: Yes, normally the bank would have been the criminal. But in this case, there was a much bigger criminal, and we were going to take our medicine and quit.

Q: There is more?

A: The ego-child ex-CEO of this NASDAQ-listed company is now living in retirement. The proprietary technology is in the hands of some people whose origin I won't mention. The COO who was blackmailed because he was very stubborn about the takeover? He's trying to get his life back together again. He's having a rough time.

Q: Was there ever a fraud investigation?

A: I'll have to be careful about how I answer that. An investigation was set to begin, and it did, in a very minor way. Then it stalled, it was mysteriously postponed, and then it went nowhere.

Q: It was shut down?

A: It was diverted into several inconsequential avenues, where the results would be unimportant.

Q: I see.

A: You don't see everything.

Q: I'm sure I don't.

A: One day, about six months later, I was approached by a reporter from one of the major daily newspapers on the east coast. He told me he was working on a story about this company whose stock I had promoted, before the bankruptcy. Which by the way, did occur. The company was re-organized and absorbed by a larger firm.

Q: And this reporter?

A: He wanted to interview me.

Q: Did you do it?

A: We met one afternoon for lunch. He told me he felt there had been some shenanigans at the company. He was fishing for information. He told me I could be an off-the-record source, because if I had been involved myself in anything illegal, well, I wouldn't want to be "exposed" by what he wrote.

Q: And you took this how?

A: As a veiled warning. He was telling me I should keep my mouth shut and "move on."

Q: So what did you do?

A: I declined to help him with his story, and he pretended to be disappointed.

Q: And he was actually a reporter for this major daily?

A: Oh yes. I spent more time checking HIM out. Again, it took me awhile. I went back and read a number of his previous stories. I found that he had, now and then, appeared on various financial talk shows, commenting on problems on Wall Street.

Q: And that meant?

A: He was a damage control boy. That's what he was there for. He would blab about this and that, but never reveal anything really damaging to the ongoing scams.

Q: You inferred all this?

A: At first. But then I gained, through Richard Bell, and others, access to a different class of expert, let's say. I'll leave it at that. And these experts confirmed that this

financial reporter was not what he seemed. He was a hired hand. For other reasons. He was in place, just like I said, to do damage control.

Q: Did he ever write a story on the company in question?

A: Of course not. Nothing ever came out of his computer on that. He never had any intention of doing a story.

Q: Did you ever speak to him again?

A: Once. I ran into him at a luncheon, and I told him he was pretty late on filing that story. I said it in such a way that he knew what I meant.

Q: What did he do?

A: He turned a vague shade of gray. And then I said, "You're not filing, I'm not filing. I don't care about that stuff."

Q: He was satisfied?

A: I suppose. I was so pissed off I spoke out of turn. I should have kept my mouth shut all together. One of those moments you let your anger get the best of you. I've become smarter.

Q: Do you think he knew that you were pursuing your own investigation into what really happened to that company and its proprietary technology?

A: Sure. That's why he approached me in the first place. He wanted to drop that hint. "We know what you're doing and we don't like it."

Q: Is this proprietary technology now in the military sector?

A: No comment.

Q: Do you know the ex-CEO, the man who is now living in comfortable retirement?

A: A little. He's, I'm sure, waking up every day with a grin on his face, saying to himself, "I've beaten the system."

Q: How many of these guys are there, just like him? That's a rhetorical question.

A: Yes. I know.

Q: Fled into the night with major bucks.

A: I'll tell you—sometimes these guys know, right at the beginning, the future of their own companies, they know what's going to happen.

Q: You mean they take over as CEOs and they know it's going to be a bust-out? They know the company is going to go into the toilet and be taken over by "larger forces?"

A: Yes. That's right.

Q: Even though it might take some years for all that to happen.

A: They've got nothing but time. When they're making all that money.

Q: So, for example—

A: A few of the guys at Enron knew, years ago, that all this was going to happen. They had their parachutes ready. They knew that their business practices were way over the line. They knew the roof was going to cave in.

Q: But this was not just your basic average premonition. You're saying it was more than that.

A: Right.

Q: So?

A: Well, I'll go general on you again. Let's say a CEO is actually a plant. He's put in there as a plant. Or it's the CFO or the COO or somebody close to the top who really runs quite a lot of the operations of the corporation. He's put in there to run the value of the company up with various scams and illegal deals and crazy lies. That's his job.

Q: You're saying that's what he was put there to do.

A: He was put there to expand the company, to help inflate the actual worth of the stock, to buy up other companies with that stock, to make the corporation into a big gorilla—and he knows the ultimate outcome will be a huge bust. He also knows the company will be put into bankruptcy and he knows it will then be re-organized. And he knows that when it is re-organized, it will still control all those companies it bought up.

Q: In other words, he helped expand the hell out of the company.

A: Yes. Because, who cares if it goes belly up? When it's re-organized, some group will be in charge, and that group will be a front for other people behind the scenes.

Q: This "imaginary CEO" we're talking about. This plant. He knows quite a lot.

A: He does.

Q: But, say, in the case of Enron, a few of these guys might go down hard.

A: Three things I'll say about that. We'll see if anyone really goes down hard. Also, the people who go down hard may be the dupes, the guys who didn't know the game. Or didn't know the whole game. And three, there is always the possibility of a double-cross at the end.

Q: In which case, the plant who is double-crossed, who is left hanging out to dry, can't really say anything.

A: He could, but who would believe him?

Q: They'd get a few psychiatrists to say he had gone off his rocker from all the stress and misery.

A: Plus, if such a man were left hanging out to dry, he would be scared to death to blow the whistle on the real deal. The real deal is managed by people who have no problem "taking care of loose ends" if that really becomes necessary. But it rarely comes to that.

Q: Do you think that Cliff Baxter, the Enron exec who supposedly committed suicide and was most probably murdered, was one of those rare cases? Those loose ends?

A: He was not a plant who knew the whole story. He was not that far up the food chain. He may have known more than he supposed to, but not at level we're discussing now.

Q: "A CEO or CFO as a plant who knows everything." Very, very interesting.

A: Yes. It's a thing of beauty, isn't it? It goes back to something I contacted you about once.

Q: What was that?

A: You wrote about a strategy where you take two opposing sides in a conflict, and you supply each side with what it needs so that they both become bigger and the conflict becomes bigger—and when it's finally resolved, by a deal, or by a war and then a deal, what you end up with is, overall, a much bigger structure than when you started. And since you controlled both sides to begin with, you now control the new synthesis of those former enemies. Your overall territory is now much larger. Well, what I'm talking about is not exactly that, but it has parallels.

Q: You build up the value of a corporation—

A: You build it up by over-inflating the value of its stock, which is an easy thing to do, if you're really dedicated. Then with that new value, the corporation goes out and buys up other companies—

Q: Which makes the parent company bigger.

A: Right. And then your hype artists push the idea that this newly expanded corporation which owns other companies is even MORE valuable, and that inflates the value of its stock even more—and you're on your way. But in some cases, there is that step we're talking about. Which comes next.

Q: And that step is?

A: You wreck the parent company. You take it down. Perhaps by exposing its various crimes. You put it into bankruptcy. You wallop its stock. And then you re-organize, re-open the doors and keep going.

Q: And why do you sometimes take that step?

A: Several reasons. One is, your strategy for expanding the corporation involves committing various kinds of fraud—among other strategies. You know, off-the-books partnerships and so on. And you know all that is eventually going to be exposed. So you want to do that exposing on your own timetable. You want to get all your ducks in a row. You want to control the temporary death of the corporation. It's good business, if you're that kind of "businessman."

Q: And if you have the even higher goal of weakening the economy of a country, because you want that country to be, more and more, like every other country, weak and vulnerable, then this "temporary death" works for that too.

A: It does.

Q: It creates a climate of demoralization and fear.

A: Indeed it does.

Q: So you're saying that the death of Enron was a pre-ordained part of the whole OP, from the beginning.

A: Boom and then bust.

Q: And then re-organization. And a new life.

A: Even if the eventual future forces that control what was once Enron's business territory appear to be diverse and broken up, they will be no more decentralized—looking from the top down—than the "death" of Ma Bell.

Q: Or the death of the Nazi cartel, IG Farben.

A: Bayer, Hoechst, BASF? They're doing very well these days. In fact, Hoechst is part of Aventis, along with Rhone Poulenc, a French company. So you could say this was an ultimate payoff that brought the former enemies, Germany and France, together. The new world. Welcome.

Q: This also sounds like the S&L scandal.

A: You know, the hard part there is when you go looking for where all those hundreds of billions of dollars went to, when the S&Ls went bust. And believe me, going bust was part of the plan. But when you start to trace down the destinations of that money, you do get to some strange places. Places that may look diverse and separate but really aren't. Pete Brewton, who did the best work on the S&L scandal, as a reporter, tried to find out where the money went. He tracked some of it. He inferred, sometimes.

Q: The CIA is a good place to look.

A: If by CIA you mean a front for even deeper interests.

Q: In this current case of ImClone and Sam Waksal [see stories on my site]—

A: And Martha Stewart—

Q: You ARE talking about proprietary technology. That drug, Erbitux? The one that the FDA would not green light? Well, think about it.

A: That's right. The drug is supposed to employ a new way of destroying tumors. Probably it doesn't work. But that's not the point. Somebody thinks it might. And they either want to shelve it, to protect the multi-billion chemotherapy industry, or they want to get their hands on it, own it, and bring it to the market and make a lot of money.

Q: The feds have Sam Waksal, the former CEO of ImClone, in a vise.

A: You can bet that when this is all over, Erbitux and the technology it represents will be in other hands. Even if by some miracle Waksal regained control of his company, he would only be the front man for other interests. So, in this sense, the whole flap over Martha Stewart makes a pretty good smokescreen for what is really at issue here: Who controls that technology. I'm not saying this is the only reason they are chasing Martha. But it works.

Q: But are you saying that Waksal's selling off of his own company's stock was part of this conspiracy to take down ImClone? That's going pretty far.

A: Of course I'm not saying that. But look at it this way. What destroyed ImClone's stock price was the FDA's decision to halt approval of Erbitux. THAT was the key thing. Waksal acted on his own to cut his losses—though I should add that his action was pretty predictable. As soon as the FDA's decision was known, the stock collapsed and the company was devastated. If their drug does make it into circulation, if it is eventually approved, it will not be in Waksal's hands anymore. It may be in the hands of ImClone's partners, Bristol Myers and Merck, and they will be the judge of how hard to push the drug. They will decide whether to shelve it or push it. And remember, Erbitux has always been promoted and tested as a companion drug to be used with traditional chemotherapy. So that's to protect the mainline chemo industry.

Q: So when a huge corporation becomes very weak or goes bust—

A: Others are there to move in.

Q: And even if an Enron is sold off in pieces to lots of different interests, ultimately?

A: That will be an illusion. See, if you break up company A and sell it or give it away to ten different companies, you have to stop thinking of these 10 companies as

discrete and separate entities. It's easy to say that BASF and Bayer and Hoechst are completely unrelated now, even though 60 years ago they were the primary components of IG Farben. But you would be making a mistake. They are not unallied. They are connected in various ways. Now.

Q: But you're not saying that all the top people in Enron knew that Enron was always destined to go down.

A: Again, of course not. Liars and cheaters and thieves are so, so easy to find and hire. And you can fit them into the overall scheme, and most of them are then just grabbing everything in sight and even inventing new scams to make more money illegally. But you only really need one or two execs who know the whole score. The whole plan. The whole curve. The whole destiny: Build, steal, lie, expand, crash, fail, re-organize, re-emerge.

Q: And if, as the Russian president, Putin, told Bush, the European Union had some heavy hitters who blew the first whistle on Enron, as part of the ongoing economic war between the EU and the US, then how does THAT fit in?

A: Assuming that is true, it's just another layer or level in the control game. Not the highest level. Just a good way to bring about what the highest players in the game want to happen. This occurs all the time in intelligence work. Who do you want to leak the story? How about someone who leaks it for his own reasons? Isn't that the best? The leaker has no idea that there are higher motives and plans within the game. He's blind, in part because he's completely consumed by his own ambitions. He's your guy. He's the one you want to leak the first details. Then you get a parade. You get a whole parade of truth-tellers.

Q: A good example of a first leaker would be Daniel Ellsberg and the Pentagon Papers.

A: Sure. He's releasing secret documents indicting the Pentagon, when in fact the truth of the matter was, all those plans and scenarios and strategies about Vietnam were coming from the CIA. Ellsberg—assuming he was ignorant of that truth—was blasting a lesser target. Actually, in a sense, an incorrect target in that particular case. The CIA knew some damaging information was going to come out. So they used Ellsberg to go off and point the finger at someone else who was a believable villain. He's not a perfect analogy for everything I'm talking about here. But as a first leaker, yes. And I'll tell you something else. Look at the Vietnam war. It was created to end up as a failure—just like Enron. But afterwards, after Vietnam, when the “re-organizing” was done, what did you have? You had a much bigger and stronger military-industrial complex in the US. And that was really the whole objective of the exercise. That, and increasing the debt of the federal government. You kind of have to think backwards to understand how these things work. If you create huge debt in a huge organization, such as the government, what's the outcome? Is it a great outcry to limit the power of that organization? Not really. The great debt actually confirms, for people, that the FUNCTIONS of that gigantic



organization are essential—how could they not be essential, since they incurred such debt? No, people simply start to argue about how the organization is going to take care of its debt. And THAT train of thought always leads to new plans which will make the organization larger and more intrusive. Understand? The thinking is, you can't shrink down an organization that built up such debt. You have to keep the expanded organization, in part because the organization, even if it is re-arranged, will be paying off its debt. It's all crazy, but it's the way it works.

Q: I really hope we can talk again. This has been very good.

A: I hope so too. Thanks.

###END###

**July 12, 2002**

Before Richard retired from the game, he engaged in stock manipulation, and he knows how it works.

Q: You said you wanted to talk about something called Perceived Damage. What is that?

A: Well, to expose a scandal, you need to have the perception that a lot of damage has been done. This is where most investigations falter.

Q: What do you mean?

A: They falter because the public and the government and the media do not acknowledge that large damage has been done to people. You have to get those facts about damage before the public in a major way.

Q: Give me an example.

A: Okay. When the NADAQ bubble burst, and the telecoms, among others, tumbled, everyone could immediately say, "There. There is investor loss. There is damage. So we have to investigate that." Even if the investigation turns out to be a fraud, or only exposes certain levels of crime, at least you have an outside chance. You have a prayer. You at least have the perception that all this damage is CONNECTED. It isn't random and it isn't fragmentary. There is the suspicion it's all coming from the same source. So you go look.

Q: Sort of a RICO idea.

A: Yes. There is the suspicion that some illegal practice underlies all the connected damage. The continuing criminal enterprise. In the case of the crashed telecoms, you find that the brokerage houses who were hyping and selling the stock of these companies were also, through their allied investment banks, backing these companies, to say it in general terms. So there was an intrinsic conflict of interest, to put it mildly.

Q: And what would be an example where there is not enough perception of damage to do an investigation?

A: The pharmaceutical industry.

Q: I see.

A: I thought you would. If you read the major media, and if you look at the various ways in which drug companies have come under scrutiny of governments, you will see no charges that there is widespread and systematic TOXICITY from the drugs themselves. Therefore, the investigation is going to falter. It's going to stop short. No continuing criminal enterprise at that level is going to be seen by the investigators.

Q: But on the other hand—

A: On the other hand, if this toxicity factor were to rise to the level where it could not be explained away, if the dots were connected among a wide variety of drugs and companies, and if someone assembled a huge cache of documents and internal company memos which showed a pattern, from company to company, of a cover-up of the real facts about the damage drugs do—then, you’ve got a whole new ballgame. You then have a little leverage. And if the stocks of those drug companies begin to plummet because there is widespread perception that TOXICITY is the major crime, then you have a true beginning. Then you have PERCEIVED DAMAGE and you have proof that the damage IS being perceived—because there it is, the stocks of those companies are falling in concert.

Q: So that is the first step. Perceived damage.

A: Yes. It’s the same with a war machine, with global arms sales. You have to make a case that there is that damage, not just in sympathetic terms, on behalf of all the victims—but that, for instance, the arms merchants are actually fomenting wars all over the place. Something like that. And the stocks of those arms companies have to slide down and down. You see, in the case of the telecoms, you have companies and/or brokers that are, in a way, ideal targets for investigation. Much easier.

Q: Why?

A: Because the public still gets service. The companies may crash, but our computers and cell phones still work. So the people who are damaged are the investors in those companies—the public which buys stocks. And that group of “victims,” that is an acceptable group that you can defend without getting into a wrangle about other factors, such as: Was the war necessary, didn’t the patient really have to take the drug to try to save his life—very thorny matters to try to debate in the national press. Hard to get a clear focus on, in major media. But investors? That’s very clean. “Many Americans were advised to plunk down their hard-earned money and buy Global Crossing, buy Qwest, and so on, and the result was a big loss of money.” It’s defined, it’s simple, people all understand that. MONEY WAS LOST. Damage was done.

Q: I get it.

A: Yes. So, what’s the lesson here? You need organized groups who work to establish PERCEIVED DAMAGE. That’s the first goal. You can’t avoid that. If your thesis is too complex, or you can’t assemble enough facts, you’re dead in the water. A group has to pick an area and go in there and establish perceived damage. Without arguing the merits and shortcomings of the environmental lobby, you can see that this is a case where, over many years, they have established perceived damage. They’ve done that. Sure, they have many detractors and opponents, but they’ve done their homework. They’ve made a case, and their work has risen to the level of page one in the biggest newspapers in the world.

Q: But have they affected the stock prices of the major chemical companies?

A: Ah yes. There is that, isn't there? All in all, they haven't done that. The investor hasn't made the connection. You see, I'm giving you a kind of framework here, a way to assess how well campaigns are doing.

Q: So in the case of the NASDAQ debacle of 2000, you had, as you say, a clean case.

A: That's right. There was no issue of product liability, which is very difficult to prove and to SUSTAIN over a long period of time. The computers actually work. The Internet works. It was just that INVESTORS LOST A LOT OF MONEY. Simple. Doable. Whereas, if you take on a government agency, like the FDA or the CIA or HUD, you're right away dealing with crimes which are all wrapped up in complexities and also political points of view. It's much more complicated to make your initial case of PERCEIVED DAMAGE. Don't get me wrong. The case exists. But to bring it down to very simple impactful facts—you have to work at it, very hard. Same with a major corporation, unless you can show a money scandal within the corporation—which, by the way, is a good way to go.

Q: So, for example, with a drug and chemical giant like Bayer—

A: You look for an internal scandal. Overstating of profits, for example. Something that people can grasp. THEY CHEATED. [Just after this interview, the media report on Merck surfaced, indicating that Merck had overstated its profits.]

Q: Old-time playground stuff. That's what you're trying to establish.

A: (laughs) That's good. Yes, that's right. The kids on the other team got inside the scoreboard and changed the score. The kid was thrown out at third base, and then he picked up the base and went home with it. Anybody can see that.

Q: I'm glad that you always bring in an activist slant on these matters.

A: Well, if I don't, then I'm just whistling Dixie. We need dedicated groups that target these areas.

Q: Of course, back in the old days, you manipulated stocks.

A: So I know the game. A stock is paper value. It is a way to create the appearance of wealth of a company. A company wants that, because then it can borrow money based on that paper value, and it can use that loan to expand. So the pressure builds to create the perception that a company's stock is worth a great deal. That's the whole push.

Q: But now we're seeing a reversal of fortunes in this area of lying.

A: Yes we are. And for the big boys, something has to take all this news off the front pages. That's the struggle on the part of the money people. How to divert the public.

Q: You mean something like a new terrorist attack?

A: Yes. You see, if lots of people with ordinary-type wealth are losing their pants in the market, it's not easy to make the issue disappear. It's not something that's happening in China, or in the urban ghettos of America. It's happening in Scarsdale and Beverly Hills.

Q: And then there is that massive fraud called the money markets.

A: That's one of the things that got me to retire. That scam was a little too rich for my blood. When global currencies were taken off the gold standard or any semblance of it, there were some honest but stupid people who thought that simply measuring the value of currencies against one another would curb the endless appetite of governments for printing more and more money. Because, if you printed too much, your currency would lose value against other currencies. But that thesis really hasn't proved out. Printing more paper money is still the strategy of choice to overwhelm all money problems. Just like running up credit cards is the strategy of choice for many people as a way of overcoming their own money problems.

Q: What is the ultimate end-game strategy for the big-time money people?

A: They want all currencies of developed nations to be equally mediocre. It's a way of reducing the power of the US, for example. If you can't rub out the desire of the Americans to produce goods for sale, then you go after the value of the money itself. You go after the abstraction directly.

Q: You take the purchasing power of the dollar—

A: And over time you diminish that power. One dollar buys less and less. The drip method of torture.

Q: And this is done by printing more money?

A: Yes, and by raising the prices of essential commodities like oil. In steps. In faltering up and down steps, so that during one period, it looks like oil is going up and then going down—but overall, the price is going up. It takes more money to buy and use oil. Also, to the average person it seems as if more money in circulation means goods will be cheaper or easier to get—but the opposite effect is achieved.

Q: And finally you get people working their tails off just to stay even.

A: Right. It's a treadmill that develops lower and lower gears. So the rat has to run harder to get the wheel to turn six times in one minute. Finally, he's stretched to the limit. In terms of his own effort. So he has no time or energy to think about anything else, to see what is happening in the world around him. His priorities become re-arranged. It's all security and protection and safety nets—and no dreams. No big dreams waiting for him to fill the shoes. He mainly feels fatigue. But this isn't really a function of physical exhaustion, in most cases. It's the result of no dreams and no big plan to make those dreams work out. That's the real formula for

fatigue. And then this is labeled depression, and he is urged to take drugs for that. It's a tightening cage. It's a funnel that feeds people into the junk-heap. People come to believe that the little consumer trinkets are all they can really expect as payoffs for all their work.

Q: In this regard, you showed me an email you received recently. I think I got the same email.

A: Yes. I don't know who wrote it, but it's brilliant. It's a fable about 10 monkeys in a cage with a door. They can get out if they want to. Somebody hangs a banana outside the cage. One monkey goes out and reaches for the banana. Suddenly, all the monkeys in the cage are sprayed with a lot of very cold water. When the monkey gets back inside the cage, another one goes out for the banana or a new banana. And the monkeys are doused again. Now, when the third monkey tries to go outside and get the banana, the other monkeys beat him up, because they don't want to get doused with the ice water. And little by little, all the monkeys in the cage learn not to go out for the banana. And then, one by one, each monkey in the cage is replaced with a new monkey, and each new monkey tries to get a banana and is beaten up by his fellows instead. Only now, there is no ice water. It's just a reflex. And finally the cage is entirely populated by monkeys who have no experience with the ice water. They just know that, if a monkey tries to go out and get the banana, they have to beat him up.

Q: The final phase. No dreams, no big dreams, no life.

A: As the world becomes more and more a collectivist proposition, in which everyone gathers around "the fire" of security and protection, tighter and tighter, every person who ventures outside the circle is labeled with the tag of the very criminal people who are supposedly responsible for the need for security.

Q: Terrorists.

A: Yes. You create terrorists and you create conditions for the rise of terrorists, and then you have created the perceived need for all this protection and security—and finally, long about the year 2020, anyone who rejects all that security for A DREAM is labeled a terrorist. It's quite a trick.

Q: It's like saying if you don't get a vaccine you're endangering the health of everyone else because they could get the disease you are now vulnerable to. You're a terrorist.

A: And they don't even stop to think—

Q: That if the vaccine is so good, why should anyone who receives it have to worry about the person who doesn't get it.

A: Right.

Q: The climate of fear.

A: That is what is being created vis-à-vis the stock market right now. It's a layered operation.

Q: Layered in what way?

A: The first layer is, banks lend corporations money while knowing that some of these idiot companies will take that money and fail, because they don't understand business. They only understand inflating the perceived value of their stock.

Q: That's layer one.

A: Yes. Layer two is these idiot companies begin to lie and cheat and steal in order to correct their own stupidity and failure. They used the loans to expand and they failed. So they now commit crimes.

Q: What's layer three?

A: Certain outside intelligence groups accumulate knowledge of this lying and cheating and stealing, and they leak this information to the press and to prosecutors and to regulatory commissions. Now you have exposure and investigation and scandal.

Q: And now, in the investment realm, you have a climate of fear.

A: That's right. How can a person invest with confidence if there is all this corporate lying and stealing going on?

Q: And so you get?

A: Failure of the mechanism.

Q: What mechanism?

A: The mechanism of the stock market. It was very flawed and corrupt to begin with. But now there is a big problem, because it IS the mechanism that was set up to allow companies to get more money and expand. And if it falters, you have no other mechanism to bring right in to take its place.

Q: What about the fact that those heavy hitters who make their living manipulating stocks up and down want this decline and failure, so they can step in and buy up more and more of the economy at bargain prices?

A: That's the further layer of the operation. It's the layer that ultimately proves that the stock market is an illusion all the way, just the way a headache caused by worry is an illusion.

Q: What do you mean?

A: The headache is real, in the sense that you feel pain. But if it is created by worry, and if you can stop worrying, then you SEE that it was an illusion. The worry was

the reality that manufactured the illusion. The whole game that involves granting sainthood to the stock market and then smashing that belief and then re-invigorating it again, and so on and so forth—all of that allows the manipulators to win every time.

Q: So, in the long run, all this negative press about scandals which then cause the market to decline—

A: That's part of the illusion, once you really see the largest parameters of the game. That's all part of the strategy of having a "good reason" to smash stock prices and take them on a down cycle—which will be followed by an up cycle.

Q: But these intelligence groups that leak information in order to weaken a nation's stock market?

A: On the level they operate, they are succeeding. And they believe in what they are doing, for their own reasons, whatever those reasons are. Everybody who plays such a game at some level believes in what he is doing—BECAUSE he doesn't see the bigger picture.

Q: So then we come to this question. Are those intell groups, for example, who are leaking info about corporate crimes—are those groups really weakening, in this case, the American economy? Or is that just an illusion?

A: No, they are weakening the productive power of the US, because lots of companies who play the "inflate our stock" game are ruined. And because there is more fear about investing. But those who really, day in and day, manipulate the stock market, are part of a Brotherhood, if you will, who see a world they intend to create. And that world will be successful economically—in the long run—and they will CONTROL that world.

Q: But what does this Brotherhood mean by "economically successful?"

A: Right. Exactly right. What they mean is, THEY will be successful. And there will be enough companies (which they control) that will produce—under a plan—enough goods to outfit the planet. A planet whose population is reduced, a planet which is in a state of slavery.

Q: Got it. But, in that case, how the hell can these companies thrive if a lot of the population is poor and if a lot of the population is wiped out or mind-controlled or fatigued? Who will buy all these produced products?

A: Now you're talking REAL end game. That is on the drawing boards. And you can believe there is much debate about these matters. But I can say that unlimited economic expansion of any kind is not going to be permitted. There is going, at some point, to be a major shake-up vis-à-vis how many companies can really exist on the planet. Even with the "re-seeding OPS" or re-population efforts you have written about. There will be too much corporate productive power driving itself



toward too few consumers. So some big changes are in store—unless we take over the reins ourselves.

Q: What about doing business with off-planet colonies which the human race creates?

A: That is one “proposal.” But because of all the foot-dragging in the space program, the timetable on that is very slow.

Q: I have a hard time keeping a straight face when I ask this question, but what about the possibility that some very powerful and benign human group among us will somehow re-arrange everything so that all humans live in a rather pleasant and peaceful way—a way that is imposed on the human race top-down?

A: Yes. That’s a cover story which some people buy into. It isn’t part of the plan.

Q: Why not?

A: Because the men who run this planet are not nice people. That’s the simplest way to explain it. You are talking about sadists and control freaks and people who look at the world as their chessboard. It tells you what—

Q: What PLANNED ECONOMY really means.

A: Well, yes. That’s right. And when you stop and think about it, why wouldn’t it mean all that? If you see the planet as a game board, and you run the game, then you are already way over the line as far as any basic human concern that might be involved. I’ve had enough experience to know that with these “chieftains,” you are talking about people who view the masses as a grave annoyance that must be dealt with, with finality.

Q: So the endless printing of money and the endless manipulation and theft of wealth, and the endless experimentation carried out on other human beings—this is what it all leads to. Wiping out and enslaving large numbers of people.

A: Yes. And the sooner we come to grips with that, the better. We have to accept that this IS the end-game the controllers have in mind.

Q: What would say to those who feel that half-conscious people might have a better chance of overcoming this juggernaut?

A: Rather than fully conscious people?

Q: Yes.

A: It’s a nice fantasy, but it really doesn’t hold water. We have to be willing to see the whole truth. If that doesn’t cause us to get up and do something, then we lose. We lose until we do something about it. Which might be tomorrow, might be the year 2050, might be the year 3000. But this isn’t a problem that can be half-solved by half-conscious people. It isn’t going to work that way.

Q: Many people would find your assessment depressing.

A: Depression is just an interim condition. We may want to believe that feeling depressed is unfair, and someone somewhere should do something about that, but—I don't care what you believe or don't believe—and I'm including in this God, or gods, or angels, or whatever. Finally, with or without help, it's us who has to do something. And if that prospect, that thought is too tiring, too fatiguing for us, then that's another interim condition. And there are lots of interim conditions. They all can happen to us, but so what, really? When we finally MOVE, we see a new energy. It's available to us, it's ours, but we have to use it.

Q: Okay. Let's review a little. You've hit all this very hard. I want to make sure your points are understood. You're saying there is a layered OP going on with money and stocks and the market and corporate scandals and so on.

A: Right.

Q: And you're saying that some banks loan companies money while knowing that those companies are going to fail, knowing that THEN the companies are going to lie and cheat to cover up that failure.

A: Yes.

Q: And then, another layer—certain intell-type groups are going to obtain all this info about the cheating and stealing and release it to the press.

A: Correct, yes.

Q: And THIS will result in a weakening of the stock market and the economy in general.

A: Yes.

Q: But that ABOVE ALL OF THIS, there is the big, big picture, which is: This basic down cycle in the economy which is created—that down cycle is USED by the major money cartel to scoop up large sectors of the economy—businesses—at bargain prices—and THEN these money people will take the economy back up again and make gigantic profits.

A: Right.

Q: But somewhere ahead, down the line, there will come a crunch. Because these money cartel people—working in concert with other controllers—also have the goal of reducing the overall population of the planet by a large degree. And even with later re-population efforts, such depop isn't going to permit thousands and thousands of corporations to produce their products at full-bore, because there will be too few consumers in the world.

A: Yes. And then will come the crunch. Then the real meaning of PLANNED ECONOMY will be apparent. A world under the grip of these cartels, where production quotas for goods and so on will be the order of the day. And slaves, lots of slaves.

Q: A very strange road you're describing.

A: It is, yes.

Q: Now, there must be at least a few groups who are part of this master plan who are not so apparent. Who are hidden even better than these cartels.

A: Well, think of it this way. What Western group would benefit greatly from such a slave world where people, by and large, are miserable and hopeless and without their dreams?

Q: I'll take a stab. Religion.

A: Organized, very well organized religion. Such as the Vatican and its multitude of franchises. And other organized religious groups, too. They will offer an answer to the thickening and solidifying "veil of tears." They will substitute their manufactured dreams for the absence of personal dreams.

Q: Not a world that succeeds for people, but a world that offers the carrot of endless hope, just out there a few miles ahead of where everybody is.

A: That's quite accurate.

Q: In order for this to happen, you need billions of people fitting into a grand system.

A: Yes, you do. And that is doable.

Q: How?

A: The system is created that so that people feel they must fit in, in order to advance what they perceive as their own self-interest. Even if that self-interest is vastly scaled down. Even if that self-interest ends up being contained within very narrow limits. Metaphorically, it's like monkeys in that fable. They HAVE TO beat up the other monkeys if those other monkeys try to go for the bananas. It's self-interest to beat up the more adventurous monkeys.

Q: But then self-interest is defined as avoidance of pain.

A: You've got it. You could construct a short descending ladder of self-interest. At the top you've got people who act on their own deepest dreams. Then down from that you have people who act in order to obtain pleasure, pleasure being conceived as a narrower or more shallow thing than "deepest dreams." And then down from that, you have people who act to avoid pain. And there you have it. It's a kind of magician's trick, because a person walks down the ladder gradually. He doesn't

perceive or remember the higher and wider elements of self-interest as he descends. He keeps adjusting his concept of self-interest, one degree at the time, as he descends. So at every point he thinks he IS acting on the basis of self-interest. And from generation to generation, there is a “loss of memory”—just like the monkeys who recall, less and less, that it was ice water dumped on their heads that started the whole thing.

Q: Even today, I’d say that most people don’t remember that there was a time when their self-interest was really a much wider and deeper ideal.

A: You’re right about that. And when self-interest becomes avoidance of pain, you’ve got groups who will magnify their presence on the scene and offer an answer that supposedly avoids all pain and gives the brightest light.

Q: Organized religion.

A: Yes. And the trick they play is, you can avoid all pain and get to paradise, but in order to do so, you have to pay. You have to go through their system of getting to paradise. And that system requires EVEN MORE obedience.

Q: Which is very corporate, when you think about it.

A: When fewer and fewer corporations rule the economic world, people will, more and more, want to work for them. For the stability, for the financial security. And the corporations will essentially say, “You can come on board. But to get the stability you want, you’ll have to be an ideal employee. You’ll have to obey all of our dictums. You’ll have to be loyal right down the line.” Just like these organized religions—which, by the way, are hoping to define their rules and regs in a much tighter way, in the future.

Q: Get to heaven by obeying us.

A: Which would be a grand triumph for, for example, the Jesuits.

###END###

**July 19, 2002**

**VATICAN GLOBAL CONTROL**

Richard Bell -- historian of money, retired manipulator of stocks. I have shared an article with Richard Bell by Dr. Ian RK Paisley about the Vatican's aims, and some of our conversation refers to that. Richard, as always, speaks with both authority and major insight.

Q: So, foreign investors are accelerating their withdrawal of money from the US.

A: A significant amount is being shifted to Europe.

Q: So is this current stock market debacle an OP run by the European Union (EU)?

A: That is true, but too simplistic. Dr. Paisley points out that the EU has been a step-operation.

Q: Meaning?

A: First came the Common Market. Then we had the European Community. Now we have the Europe Union. At each step, people were told, "This is a good and limited concept." That was all a joke. It was always about creating one giant Euro-super-state, under the control of a few people.

Q: And so?

A: So, the Vatican has been everywhere during this step-operation, urging the parties forward, promoting the idea of UNITY. Which is always a winner. People like that concept. Paisley points out that unity is used as a soft hammer to make people forget who is doing the wrong thing and who is doing the right thing. UNITY as a tool of propaganda means: No one is really bad. Make alliances with everyone. Melt into One. That is a disastrous political policy.

Q: And the Vatican is pushing the mission of the EU because?

A: Because making friends and influencing people and playing nice and urging unity IS the current strategy of the Vatican, in these times. It is using that soft approach to create bigger political structures, over which it can exercise control. People forget that a dedicated Roman Catholic, if he is at the head of a large organization, can easily function as a front for the Vatican. If you have ten men like this, all of them powerful, all of them who have been helped by the Church into their positions of power, then you are looking at a formidable controlling force—which owes its allegiance to the Vatican.

Q: Name such a man.

A: Jacques Delors, who was president, at one point, of the European Commission. He met with Dr. Carey, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and they spoke of this "shared spirituality" that was needed. But that term, for the Vatican, is code for "the one and

only Church.” Its Church. People shrink away from realizing that the Vatican has ALWAYS considered itself the rightful ruler of Earth. I can’t be any plainer than that. And all this footsy-playing with other religions and churches is just drivel, behind which lies the real agenda. Paisley, in his article, quotes a letter from the Pope John Paul II to the Archbishop of Prague—“We cannot simply conceive of Europe as a market of economic exchanges or a place for the circulation of ideas but, above all, it must be a genuine community of nations, which want to unite their future and live like brothers, respecting the cultures and spiritual traditions...” You KNOW this is a fraud, because if there is one thing the Roman Church, behind the scenes, does NOT respect, it is the “various spiritual traditions.” That’s the soft soap. That’s the New Agey stuff, the warm fuzzy. That’s the front behind which the Vatican licks its chops, as it contemplates an EU which is fully organized and ready for further takeover from Above. Above, being the Vatican itself. This is no joke. This is almost two thousand years of plotting and conniving and working toward the goal of Rule. But people reject the idea because they think that the Vatican is weak and lost and can never command billions of people to walk into a Church and fall on their knees. But you see, the Vatican, above all, has patience. The long-term goal has thousands and thousands of steps. I know this from numerous contacts over the years. Near the end of my career on Wall Street, I used to tell my friends—changing a quote I had once read—“The Jews who are not Jews run Wall Street at the pleasure of the British financiers who have an illusory idea about the primacy of England, and they in turn serve at the pleasure of the Vatican, which remains in the shadows.” It’s more or less a straight line, and the top of the line gives you the group which appears to be the weakest. Appears. That’s the operative word. If you read Tupper Saussy’s fine book, *Rulers of Evil*, you will discover that the first translation of Sun-tzu’s classic treatise, *Art of War*, into a Western language was made in 1772, in French. By Joseph-Marie Amiot, an astronomer in the court of the Emperor of China. Amiot was a Jesuit priest. The Jesuits know all about appearing weak into order to win, and they are perhaps the world’s greatest appliers of Sun-tzu. And they are in it for the long haul.

Q: Then what function, in this scheme, does the EU play?

A: The shill.

Q: Explain.

A: The shill parks himself near the con man and makes it seem like the game can be won easily. The shill is the man who makes it look easy. I stretch the meaning of the term a little. But a shill is a bright penny that attracts attention. The EU represents UNITY. Unity is the bright penny that exclaims, “Look! We can do it. We can all live in harmony. All we need to do is sit down and talk long enough, and all our divisions and conflicts will be solved.” The shill draws the crowds. The shill makes the crowd think there is something very good here. The shill is the magnet, if you will, that sucks in the customers, the adherents, the loyal ones, the people of hope. It’s the oldest trick in the book. And the people who play this trick on a grand scale are very, very clever. They want total domination, but they carve out a circuitous route,

because that is the way to arrive. They set up a front which is the shill, and the shill looks very, very good. I don't mean to offend anyone by this, but for the Vatican, Jesus is a shill, the ultimate shill. Of course, their version of him is so far from the older concept it isn't even funny. But I digress.

Q: So you're saying that the Vatican looks for a group that can appear to be very, let's say, humanitarian, and it uses that to attract followers.

A: Of course. What do you think they spend their time doing? But in their secret "catechism," creating groups which appear to do good works is really the creation of shills. That's half of what the Vatican DOES.

Q: People at large would appear to be quite hypnotized NOT to believe this.

A: That's why I don't like to talk about it too often. It's frustrating. People look at me like I've stepped on their precious cat.

Q: Okay. Let's take this a step further. How about this? "The Vatican, working through certain players in the EU, have been making war on the US stock market."

A: Now you're clicking.

Q: And the motive is?

A: To weaken anything powerful that is not completely within the circle of power of the Vatican.

Q: Even if such weakening brings about chaos.

A: Especially if it brings about chaos. The very atmosphere in which the Vatican thrives. Chaos ALWAYS equals new followers who are looking for a way to assuage their fear.

Q: You're saying this is just a current OP that follows along with a very old strategy.

A: A strategy in which the Vatican is the master.

Q: Now, in your years on Wall Street, did you run into people who knew all this, who saw the larger dimensions of the game?

A: I did. Mostly, they kept their mouths shut. Essentially, you're asking me, "What does a mid-level or low-level player in an ultimately corrupt game do when he discovers a few of the larger dimensions of that game?"

Q: Well, you could say that question applies, in a sense, to all of us, if you stretch the meaning a little.

A: Exactly. That IS the question, isn't it? We may not be willing and conscious participants in the direction the game is going, but we are in the game, one way or another. I myself WAS a man who twisted the truth to maneuver money in certain

ways. And finally, because I was very bull-headed, because I was very selfish—it took me quite awhile to wake up and get out of my own trap.

Q: Here is another Paisley quote. “Deliberate engineering to create the coming about of the European Union provides an enormous opportunity to develop and extend the influence of the Church of Rome. Remember, it is Roman Catholic laymen who, from the beginning, were behind the formation of, and today continue to push the growth of, the European Union.”

A: And look at something else. What is one of the most important economic wars for market share on the planet?

Q: The one between the US and what is now the EU.

A: Yes.

Q: Part of the reason the EU was formed was to give a Europe a chance to compete with the US in that area.

A: Yes. And, situated above all this, its sights set on weakening that “far too independent nation,” the US, has been the Vatican. And one step in that weakening operation is the current trashing of US corporations and the stock market. Which, covertly, was an OP launched by the EU, behind which firmly stands the Vatican.

Q: Layers of the onion.

A: Right.

Q: There are undoubtedly other forces at work in the weakening of the US trading markets.

A: There are. But the big unnoticed one—that’s what I’m describing.

Q: Let’s get back to the shill. Who stands behind him?

A: In a very mild situation, it’s just a con man. But when you get really nasty, you’re talking about somebody who operates like a demon.

Q: Do you mean that literally?

A: No. But other people would. I’m talking about somebody who OWNS somebody else.

Q: Take a very loyal Roman Catholic businessman of great wealth.

A: Yes. One who owes the Church and its agents all he has—because they engineered a lot of it for him. This is a kind of shill, who attracts people to his side. And behind him is the possession force—the people who own him, who, if they want to, can destroy everything he holds precious. And the businessman knows that. Somewhere inside him, he knows it and is afraid of it. The shill and the demon.



Q: A good title for a book.

A: Yes.

Q: Along this line, here is another quote cited by Paisley. This is from Paul Henri Spaak, who has been called one of the founding fathers of the Euro Common Market, the forerunner to the EU: "We [Europe] do not want another committee. We have too many already. What we want is a man of sufficient stature to hold the allegiance of all people [of Europe] and to lift us out of the economic morass in which we are sinking. Send us such a man and be he god or the devil we will receive him."

A: Yes. I read that quote with great interest. It gives off quite a bit of flavor, doesn't it?

Q: Yes.

A: All sorts of resonance. On one level, it almost seems to be a call for a Satan. On another level, for a fascist dictator waving a wand over Europe.

Q: The Vatican did support Hitler in certain ways and felt it could control him.

A: And that was so. If Hitler had conquered Europe, the Vatican, with its far-flung and very well-placed agents of distinction, would have controlled him sooner or later. Hitler, despite some of his statements, was quite enamored of the Church.

Q: What other resonances do you get from Spaak's statement?

A: He is asking for someone like a Pope, if a Pope could move out of being a figurehead into real power day to day. I also get the sense that Spaak is willing to roll the dice against any odds because he feels, at that time, that future of Europe is in a very desperate situation.

Q: So the formation of the EU was really a desperate move, in some ways.

A: At the level of business-people and financiers and bankers in Europe, it was. At the mid-level. And when you are in that frame of mind, you are willing to do anything to regain the kind of power you feel is rightfully yours. Your solution is ALWAYS for a form of fascism, regardless of what face you put on it. You have to remember that.

Q: The EU was a fascist movement.

A: Covertly, yes. Absolutely. Whether you have one man standing on a balcony shouting to crowds, or a bunch of men quietly sitting in a room making all the really important decisions, it is fascism.

Q: Paisley also quotes from—

A: You mean the Sunday Telegraph article?

Q: Yes.

A: I have it here.

Q: Read it.

A: July 21, 1991. The headline was, "Hatching a New Popish Plot." It reads, "Karol Wojtyla [the Pope] is calmly preparing to assume the mantle which he solemnly believes to be his Divine Right—that of the new Holy Roman Emperor, reigning from the Urals to the Atlantic."

Q: What do you think of that?

A: If you insert the word "secret" in there, I think they've got it right. You see, we live in an age when humanitarianism is the—

Q: Propaganda foundation stone.

A: Right.

Q: Why is that?

A: Because so many popular movements aimed at freedom and justice have filled the landscape. So the strategy of the controllers is to go with that. Just like in judo. You go with the motion of your opponent. You don't try to lash out at it. Part of the Art of War.

Q: You become the great peacemaker and mediator.

A: That's right.

Q: That's the ultimate trump card.

A: And the Vatican has a long history of being able to play that card.

Q: Does there come a time when, even if enough people see through the crap, it's too late?

A: No. But you do have to do certain things.

Q: Like what?

A: You have to expose the propaganda. That's number one. You have to do that. Then you have to build alternative structures. All sorts of them. And you have to forget about asking the bad guys for help. The whole idea of being nice to people who will do everything they can to control you never works. And if you understand the real motives and intentions of the enemy, you WON'T make that mistake.

Q: You won't assume that nicey-nice will turn them around.

A: Correct.

Q: The shill and the demon.

A: The front and the back.

Q: Some stories about demons have them feeding off and enjoying the emotions and pain and troubles and suffering of the people they lock on to.

A: I think that's a fairly good description of the Vatican down through history. If you add in, bilking the people of their money and possessions.

Q: Then it would seem a little curious to have the Vatican calling demonic stuff the evil that must be opposed and defeated.

A: I think that's characterized as a Cover Story. You'll find it in a number of areas. The enemy you prop up or invent to solidify your group is really YOU. It's pretty clever.

Q: Several writers have suggested the Vatican has fallen into being the epitome of devilishness, within its own walls.

A: I enjoy those stories. Because I think they miss the point that the Vatican has been about deception and control since its beginnings. After all, why bother to build a global organization to dominate a path that is supposed to lead to personal salvation? Why not just mark out the path and let people walk it on their own? If they want to? You can't force someone to take that path. If you do, you get a false result, a fake result.

Q: So you feel that secret societies are important in the telling of real human history. Since the Vatican is really such a society.

A: Yes, that's right. I'm a person who's come to conclude that people really do sit down and meet in rooms, that even if they share common goals—and they do—that's not enough to mount long-term projects and operations. It's just common sense. If you fight a land war, don't you have meetings? Don't you iron out strategy? Don't you hide that strategy? Don't you use many agents in the intelligence field? Don't those agents pretend to be something other than what they are? Imagine what would happen if the generals just assumed they all had shared objectives and proceeded on their own. It would be a moronic thing from the outset. The Jesuits are the intell arm of the Church, in exactly the same way that the CIA works. They obtain information, and they also do covert OPS. I have met more than a few very, very bright Jesuits who are in the financial field. They certainly know what they're doing. They certainly keep their real objectives close to the vest.

Q: How low do you think the Dow is going to fall?

A: I think to make a serious estimate of that would be a mistake, if you are a person who is trying to acquire useful knowledge about markets. It's too up in the air. It's the wrong target of knowledge to shoot for. But just to guess, for the hell of it—we

could see the Dow go down from 11,000, where it was, to 7500 or even 7000, or 6500. But that's just a foolish guess.

Q: If it did go that low, what would it mean?

A: (laughs) It would mean it's going to go back up. But just as a top in the market is a confusing time, the same is true of a bottom. All sorts of false starts that go nowhere. Up, then collapse. Up, then collapse again. And then, it finally begins to move up. But you see, all this is thinking about a fantasy, really. Because we don't know. We could make a hundred predictions and then say, after one of them turns out right—see, on August 24, I said 7000 and I was right. As a market drops lower, more of the big-time money people grab up what they want. And the lower it gets, the MORE big-time are those who grab up huge numbers of shares in their areas of interest. It's feeding time for the vultures and vampires and demons. They could be ready to take the market up by next week, or it might be two years from now. When the trinket that is dangling from your wrist is the stock market or the economy of a nation, you can pretty well figure that WHIM and SADISM are prominent motives. And also, what you can get away with, given your goals.

Q: But if the Vatican is a major force behind the current weaken-America OP, when is enough going to be enough?

A: Now you're talking a lot of different of different factors.

Q: Such as?

A: The most important ones are those around the question, "How many of your own people, who are very loyal, but also not in on the true Game—how long can they hold out and stay loyal and not just go nuts?" You want to keep your structure in place. You want chaos, but you also want your vast network to be able to act. Those are tricky questions for controllers. All sorts of personal feelings can enter in.

Q: In the past, I've heard you talk, in relation to investing, about over-focus and under-focus. What do those terms mean?

A: Under-focus would be, I want to predict how far the market is going to fall, and THEN I'll decide what to buy or sell and when. That doesn't work. Over-focus would be, at the close of trading on Monday, when everyone is getting in to buy up the stocks that have fallen heavily during the morning, I'm going to get in and pick the heaviest loser of the day and buy it, because it's going to go back up tomorrow. That's a complete crap-shoot, too. But you know, these two principles work in all sorts of areas. In personal relationships, an over-focus would be, he scratches his face once in awhile and that bothers me. Under-focus would be, he's spending all our money but I'm sure he knows what he's doing. Neither extreme works.

Q: Do you think the world is doomed?

A: What do you mean by doomed?

Q: All 6 billion of us are going to fall under a steel-trap tyranny and we won't be able to get out.

A: Well, we can always get out. But it has to start from the bottom. To try to change everything from the top is a waste of time. You have to know as much as you can about what's going on at the top to know what to do at the bottom.

Q: I thought you'd say that my question was asking you to do an under-focus.

A: Very tricky. No, I think the closer you get to an understanding of what's going on at the top, the better prepared you are to take action.

Q: It occurs to me that your analysis of shills and demons applies to the medical cartel.

A: It certainly does. You have your studies and your testimonials from celebrities and your poster kids for diseases and socialite fund-raisers for research—and they are all shills. Most of them are unknowing shills. The studies are fakes, by the way. But all the shills are fronting for the same system of medicine that kills so many people. The demons are certain people who really set the agenda, the research agenda for the drug companies. They know they are killing people and making money doing it.

Q: They take pleasure from death?

A: It's very politically incorrect to suggest that, but it's true.

Q: Many people would say, how can it be true?

A: You have to realize that there are people in this world who do, in fact, take pleasure from that. That's the way they are. You can offer all sorts of explanations for how they got that way, but most of that is just to let them off the hook. They don't deserve that reward. They are evil, and they want to be evil. On a much smaller scale, look at the corrupt broker who enjoys hyping stocks to customers when he knows that he has no idea whether the stock is going to go up or down. He enjoys the weird power in that. He likes it. He likes stealing money and lying and getting away with it. The sooner we come to grips with this, the sooner we'll be able to get our nations back on the right course. Do you feel how much opposition there is to saying that so-and-so criminal just wanted to commit his crimes? We retreat from that, we try to make it all so complex and nice and we want to restore "harmony" by explaining away the whole thing. But these people do exist. They wear very expensive suits, some of them, and they get their feeling of life from destruction. It's a kick for them.

Q: Getting back to the Vatican—

A: Yes. Getting back to that, part of the big psychological OP of the second half of the 1900s has been the idea that everyone is good and should be approached that

way. This is one of the front ideas of the Roman Church, in its latest fake incarnation of “share and care.” It’s just a ruse, but it certainly screws up whole civilizations.

Q: I think one reason people love soap operas so much is because they give us a smattering of characters who are evil and like being evil. It’s right out there.

A: I’m sure that’s true.

Q: We’ve just seen the \$60 billion merger of two drug companies, Pfizer and Pharmacia. This makes Pfizer, which was already the largest drug house in the US, even bigger.

A: There are many reasons for these mergers, but looking at it from the top of the basic control agenda, it’s all about shrinking down the number of people who have any say in what happens to us. In empire building, the people who really sit behind the scenes want larger and larger structures to emerge, because, if they can control THOSE, they can control the whole show. If you have 4 million important power groups on the planet, then controlling the planet is going to be hard. But if you can shrink that number of groups down to a hundred, you can move in and work on the leaders of those hundred groups—the people who aren’t already in your pocket—and you can begin to move them into your orbit. This is a basic fact that many people seem to understand, but they forget it or ignore the mechanics of how it works, and they move on. They shouldn’t move on. That’s IT.

Q: As we talk here, I get the feeling that you have some experience with Vatican recruiting methods—undertaken, of course, through many lower-level cutouts.

A: You’re right. I do. It’s in the area of making lay-Catholics into agents. I have known several people who were approached. The basic routine went like this. A Catholic businessman in a large city is contacted by the local chapter of one of those Catholic groups. There are scores of them. They have different names. They all seem benign or charitable or merely honorary.

Q: So this businessman goes to a meeting.

A: Sure. A lunch, a meeting. He ends up joining the group. He’s already a successful man. Very energetic and ambitious. Wants to get ahead. So, after a year or so, an opportunity is placed in his path. One of his new friends in the group introduces him to a loan officer at a bank, and before you know it, he gets cash to expand his business. Things are starting to cook. This is a fairly slow process, and at every step the businessman is vetted. Loosely, because nothing has really happened yet. But after another year or two, he acquires a partner in a new venture. The partner is also a member of this lay-Catholic club. The new venture prospers. The businessman meets the local bishop. He is nominated for some kind of layman of the year award. He doesn’t win, but his profile is raised. After years of not going to church, he now goes. He even receives confession once a month. After three or four years, he is introduced to a “financial expert” who is also from the same local group. The expert is really a Jesuit, but very few people know that. The Jesuit

becomes his friend. He takes him on trip to Rome, and they have an audience with a cardinal. Brief. On and on it goes. The businessman is vetted every step of the way. He buys into a construction company. He is now becoming rich. He doesn't think much about it, but his new lifestyle is really dependent on his acquired Catholic friends. And all they have done for him. He of course would never want to give up the new lifestyle. And now, on a business trip, he meets a woman in a bar. She is quite pretty and friendly. They sleep together. Every time he goes to that city on business, he meets her. Unknown to him, their meetings are recorded on videotape. The Jesuit friend, one day, manages to bring up the subject of this woman. Because the Jesuit friend knows her. He tells the businessman that she is a prostitute, and even though she may not have charged him any money, well—and so the businessman goes to confession and tells the story to his priest. And so on and so forth. And ten years later this man is really all the way in the pocket of his Jesuit friend. And in the case I'm describing, we eventually get to political office. Running for office. And winning. And down the road, with a lot of money in the bank, and many political favors later, this businessman is offered a post in a federal agency. Has to do with foreign trade. He takes the job, on the strong recommendation of his Jesuit friend. And finally, after several more turns of the wheel which I won't describe, this businessman becomes an ambassador. And is completely beholden. He takes orders, although he may not think of it that way. And he is an agent. He passes along information to his friend. Lots of information. And he becomes trusted. And now he is told of a larger program. It involves making the Church more prominent in the lives of many people. The expansion of the influence of the Church--because that's really what it's all about, isn't it? And this businessman joins another Catholic group, and is made a knight. The businessman is never considered to be an insider, because he has certain scruples. So he is used as he can be used. And one day, for three minutes, he meets the Pope, as part of a group. It is the culmination of his adult life. He has passed along a great deal of information to his Jesuit friend, for years.

Q: What kind of information?

A: From diplomatic cables, for example. Some of these cables contained sensitive information. The Church has been interested in various delicate negotiations between the US and a foreign nation.

Q: So you're saying, multiply this by a factor of a few thousand such agents—

A: Many more than that.

Q: Okay—

A: And you get a tremendous flow of information coming into Vatican intelligence. And this is just information I'm talking about. There are also favors of all kinds. You know, if you read the first few pages of Saussy's book, *Rulers of Evil*, you'll see a list of Roman Catholics in government who have had key positions vis-à-vis US foreign policy. Positions like CIA Director, National Security Advisor, Secretary of State,

Ambassador-at-Large. And there is also a list of senators who run [or ran] the various sub-committees within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—all Roman Catholics. Biden, Subcommittee on European Affairs. Sarbanes, International Economic Policy. Moynihan, Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. Kerry, Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Communications. Dodd, Western Hemisphere and Peace Corps Affairs.

Q: Yes. I've seen the list. And that is just the beginning. Saussy goes on to name "virtually every aspect of secular life in America," as he puts it, which is run, as a government chairmanship of a committee, by a Roman Catholic Congressional representative. It's staggering. Here are just a few of those areas: "...insurance, housing, community development, federal loan guarantees, economic stabilization measures...gold and precious metals transactions, agriculture...flood control, minority enterprise...vaccines, drug labeling and packaging, drug and alcohol abuse...energy...bank regulation..."

A: And people in America still tend to think of Jack Kennedy as the only Catholic who ever really had huge secular political power in the US. Which, when you think about it, is a very under-mentioned piece of fall-out from the JFK assassination. Makes an excellent cover story, doesn't it? "No more major presence of Roman Catholic power in the secular US government. Jack is dead."

###END###



## **October 11, 2002**

In this interview, Richard looks out at the future, and gives clues to the emerging scenarios in the ongoing power game. This one is a ripper.

Q: So what do you see happening in the Third World?

A: It's all about maintaining the fiction of nations. Or to put it another way, how do you maintain the shells of nations, while passing over control to higher and higher entities-and-people on the ladder of global power.

Q: So you don't see the total disappearance of national fronts.

A: Not in the foreseeable future. Look at the European Union, which is the most radical development among a group of nations on the planet. Even there, the nations are still thought of as separate bodies.

Q: It's a convenient fiction.

A: Yes. The nations are cutouts for higher powers. Why give that up? Why destroy the trend of developing de facto global power, in favor of erasing national names?

Q: Are all countries in the world cutouts?

A: Absolutely. If you don't see that, you don't see anything.

Q: These days, people are screaming about the American thirst for global empire.

A: They would. And that tells you that just the opposite is happening. The US is best and biggest cutout of all.

Q: For whom?

A: David Rockefeller, certain royal families, certain controllers of large banking entities, certain planetary planners who run those organically evolving cartels.

Q: Cartels. Government, money, intelligence, military, energy, media, medical, religion.

A: Yes.

Q: So what is the plan for the Third World?

A: One aspect is basically bankrupting every one of them. As a kind of further initiation rite in the process of them handing over their power.

Q: One could say the US is bankrupt, if one really looked at the financial situation.

A: But bankruptcy, when it comes to nations, is really a mark.

Q: A mark?

A: Yes. It is a mark placed next to their names. Its reality is irrelevant. In a sense.

Q: Explain.

A: If you have a debt you can't pay, are you bankrupt? Only if your creditor forces you to declare it. Or only if you voluntarily decide to state that yourself.

Q: So the IMF---

A: Makes up its own mind. Do we want a nation to say it is broke? Do we want to extend enough credit to keep it out of bankruptcy? Do we want to ignore the fact that it IS bankrupt? See?

Q: Yes.

A: It's all a matter of perception, and the eyes that perceive are in the heads of the controllers. They see what they want to see, and they act accordingly.

Q: So, in effect, if tomorrow 50 nations held a joint press conference and said, "We're all bankrupt." What then?

A: (laughs) That would be a very Zen strategy, actually. A kind of international judo. It would shake things up quite a bit, if those nations were prepared to launch into a whole new way of doing business and counting money and so on. But those 50 nations are, in fact, all hypnotized by the Club, the snake. They, the nations, want to be in the Club.

Q: And the Club is saying to them?

A: "We'll decide how much money you have and how well you're paying off your national debts and when and if you'll declare bankruptcy."

Q: You started out by saying that the global controllers do intend to bankrupt every nation in the Third World.

A: I did. But what form will that take? How will it be done? Will there be trumpets and crashing cymbals, or will it all happen in a private room, quietly, with threats and conditions? I'm talking about a more private form of bankruptcy, in which the debtor nation becomes a de facto slave of the controllers. This occurs by degrees, not as a single proclamation.

Q: So in Argentina, for instance?

A: They have entered the dark night of the soul. A new level of turnover of assets is occurring there. A re-shuffling of economic power. I mean, Argentina was already under the thumb of the IMF and other big players. But now the re-shuffling will be more extensive. Imagine it like a descending staircase.

Q: Argentina is, say, a third of the way down the staircase, whereas Venezuela is only a sixth of the way down.

A: Something like that, yes.

Q: I see.

A: And as a nation goes further down the staircase, its official leaders are, more and more, puppets.

Q: Okay.

A: In Brazil, I don't hold out much hope for the election of Lula, the Worker Party candidate. He may win, but then what? He can't carve out some version of classic socialism inside the dilemma he's facing. The monsters are on all sides.

Q: His only way out is to secede from the world economic community, try to go it alone with the help of some of his neighbors.

A: The odds against him doing that are large. We'll see. But Brazil is obviously a choice plum for the Club. They aren't going to let it go just because some altruist wants to re-do the structure.

Q: There are some smart people in Latin America who see the massive emigration to America as a form of war against the Giant of the North.

A: They're whistling in the dark. The Club wants America to be weakened by immigration. America is on schedule to start down the staircase itself. It's already down there a step or two.

Q: What about the depopulation OP in the Third World?

A: It's a slow process, overall, if you look at the numbers. But it's in the works. The Club wouldn't be disappointed if two-thirds of everybody in South America disappeared overnight. That's their basic attitude in a nutshell.

Q: Do you still see AIDS as one major cover story behind which depopulation will continue to take place?

A: Absolutely. The Club plans to get a lot more mileage out of that OP. AIDS is about a quarter of way along as an OP. It's really still in the advance publicity phase. You know, telling the world how dire it's going to get soon. The Club has to do a lot more prep work to condition the global population to more rapid declines in population numbers. The Club---

Q: Wants the global population to accept more dire depopulation. By degrees. It doesn't want too huge an outcry.

A: Correct.

Q: I've written about the re-seeding part of the depopulation OP.

A: Yes. Bringing in whole generations of people, some local, some imports, to man the mega-corporations that will run the day to day life in South America and Africa. All the employees, from managers down to laborers. But you need more of a transnational corporate presence to do the re-seeding on a large scale. It's already happening, but slowly.

Q: How extensive is the mapping of natural resources in the Third World?

A: Very. The maps are precise. The work there has been going on for a very long time. The killing off and the dislocation of small farmers in, say, Colombia, is just the tip of that part of the OP. The Club wants naked land. For mega-agri-business, and for mineral and oil extraction, and for re-forestation, which is the creation of wide natural barriers against the possibility of contagious revolutionary wars carried out by people with relatively few weapons. And then you have projects on the drawing boards---like the creation of whole cities, planned cities rising up in the middle of the jungle.

Q: Would these cities just be monuments to egos?

A: No, not entirely. They are experiments in planned living. The idea is to invent whole locales, attached to mega-corporations, where daily life is very controlled. Where the inhabitants live in "peace." No crime, control over free speech. Total security. Even regulated pleasure. Experiments done to see how this all works, what needs to be adjusted, what new steps need to be taken. A big evolving experiment. This is actually planned for more than the Third World. This is, in a sense, the face of the world a hundred years from now. The planned face.

Q: What do you mean, regulated pleasure?

A: You're into a very big area there.

Q: How so?

A: Well, start from the question, what pleasure ultimately subdues and makes people loyal? In other words, if pleasure is doled out from the top, what kind of pleasure will secure the allegiance of the inhabitants? Is it a mix of honky-tonk and sophisticated machines that tap in to brain centers? What is it? A vast area of experimentation.

Q: So, in a new jungle city where a Dow or a Du Pont runs the show with ample military/police back-up and the whole local government in its pocket---

A: Right. What pleasures are permitted? How is that arranged? How can the latest technology be brought to bear on the situation, so that everyone feels satisfied, so that everyone can blow off just the right amount of steam?

Q: Sounds like science fiction.

A: The whole world is science fiction.

Q: Planned living.

A: That's the operative phrase. You don't achieve it overnight. Not by a long shot. The development of new medical drugs, for example. Brain drugs. Where will that be in a hundred years? Can you get a person to the point where a daily dosage of pills or a skin patch or an insert under the skin will keep him happy for years on end? Months? Weeks? What's the limit, after which he breaks out and goes crazy? Do you need certain "underground" areas of the city where people can go on a Saturday night and fight and rage and kill? Or can that be bypassed, in favor of other less gross outlets, as a way of obtaining loyalty for the rest of the week?

Q: How much art do you need, and what kind?

A: Right.

Q: But it's planned.

A: The Club, if it is anything, if it evolves into anything, is all about planning. As one small victory builds into the next small victory, the planners learn and they get new ideas, and they create new mini-experiments.

Q: And if those experiments fail, some of them?

A: Then there are post-mortem studies, and new projects are mounted.

Q: New experiments.

A: Yes.

Q: And suppose, in one city, a mega-corp finds that it can automate so much of its operation with machines that it doesn't need many humans at all?

A: Then they try that and see how it works out over a period of time. But there is a limiting factor here.

Q: Which is?

A: It has to do with the psychological make-up of the controllers, the Club.

Q: How so?

A: Do the controllers really want, basically, to run the "lives" of machines, or is the whole point to control humans? And if the latter, then how many loyal humans are necessary to impart the feel of "empire" to these controllers? How much conflict? How much resistance? If the whole enterprise, at some distant point in the future, becomes a null game, if the whole thing is too easy, then what?

Q: I'm sure there are some wild cards in this whole plan.

A: Of course. Suppose, for example, certain researchers find a reliable way to engender so-called psychic abilities in people, through the use of technology? Maybe not permanent abilities, but over a short term. That would be a very attractive development. But how would it be put to use inside the overall scheme? Who would get these perks? Suppose the technology leaked out into the general population? All sorts of possibilities.

Q: I haven't heard you talk about religion in this future you're describing.

A: Another possible wild card. The Vatican has its own plans, has had its own plans for world domination, since the beginning of the Christian era. More room for conflict there, but in this case, at the top.

Q: How might that play out?

A: Well, my own take on the Vatican is that it's always been Satanism in disguise. And the disguise has been conscious, at the top levels of control within the Church. These people have been panting and drooling over the possibility of finally removing the mask and going all out for their vision of the Devil. It's what they're really about. Of course, who would stand for that? How would that be received? The Vatican has been wise enough to realize that it can't take the chance of being exposed as a gigantic cult, a sort of de Sade parading in full bloom under the eye of the public. Too radical. The Church lives off of clandestine infiltration of secular organizations of all kinds, and off of cutouts and more cutouts. So I would assume that that would go on.

Q: Do you see, say, in South America, a future in which the powerful presence of the Church is brought in by other members of the Club to nail down their control of that continent?

A: Absolutely. But everything is provisional and transitional. So everything depends on how far out into the future we're looking. The Vatican may well eventually get caught in a squeeze play.

Q: Between what and what?

A: Between, on one side, the religious disinterest of the public, a public which is more and more becoming a creature of, by, and for technology--- and on the other side, the other members of the Club, who see no reason to use the basic mind control operation of the Church as a tool to gain their vision of the new world.

Q: The Church becomes obsolete as an instrument for the pursuit of power.

A: Yes. And there are people in the Vatican who can foresee this outcome. These people are smart. Don't doubt that for a moment. Which is why the Church tends to support, covertly, and foment, covertly, every possible eruption that will drive people back into a lower form of life in which technology is ruined, destroyed, bankrupted. And in this case, when I say technology, I mean---

Q: All the pleasurable accoutrements we take to comprise modern living.

A: Yes.

Q: So, in a sense, the Church is going in one direction (a new Dark Age), and the other members of the Club are going in an opposite direction.

A: Right. However, if the depopulation OP and the general takeover of Third-World countries is to proceed more intensely, there will be periods in which there is even more general suffering than there is now. And that suffering will extend to the industrialized countries as well. It is in that period that the Church will make its stand.

Q: Because that's the sort of epoch in which it makes its real hay.

A: Yes. Although the Church could eventually take on the shape of something like a super-major royal family. You know, on the surface it looks defunct and impotent, but behind the scenes it owns great amounts of land and mineral wealth and so on.

Q: In which case, the church would become, even more, a secular institution.

A: Right.

Q: How do you explain the influential presence of liberation theology in Latin America, a Jesuit movement which brought about a number of popular revolutionary groups which wanted to take power away from "the thirteen families" that typically own whole countries?

A: It was a brief series of moves on the chessboard. It really was aiming for more chaos, because at no time did the Jesuits think that these revolutionaries they were assisting would really take power. And what has really happened? Is liberation theology alive and well and thriving in any Third-World country today? Are any of those "thirteen families" unseated, with a few exceptions?

Q: No.

A: And if the Vatican had really wanted to sustain that movement, do you think it [liberation theology] would be virtually impotent today? No. It was a momentary and planned move on the chessboard, and its real purpose---from the top level---was, the creation of more war and chaos. If liberation theology had really wanted to bring a new form of living to South and Central America, the Vatican would have sold a few paintings in its cellar and taken the hundred of millions of dollars and used it to organize a really powerful international labor union---stretching from South Africa to Argentina to El Salvador. The fact that this wasn't done was no oversight or mistake. What really remains of liberation theology, a few key court battles by indigenous peoples to get back stolen land---look at how poorly that effort is financed. It isn't going to turn the tables on land ownership in Latin America. Motivating peasants in Latin America was, in the long run, just a diversion from the really workable strategies that could have been bankrolled and forwarded.

Q: There are people who look at the Pope and say, "The Vatican is a doddering old sentimental fool."

A: How nice for the Vatican. Do you think Rome is going to unveil a brilliant, vigorous world planner who gives away the plot to the piece while it's being played out? In the same sense, if you attend a few Council on Foreign Relations meetings, or some brain-deadening World Trade organization planning sessions, or a free-trade conference, or a British get-together of some offshoot of the Roundtable, do you think you're going to find some very understandable people spelling out how globalization is really taking place and will take place? Out front are the dupes and the bores and the recipients of organization grants and doddering fools who think they belong to a high-end fraternity of sophisticates with altruistic motives. It's always a bad movie in these places. And the reporters who attend, and can't see what's going on, are a little too much in awe of the fact that they got in the door at all.

###END###



## **October 25, 2002**

In this interview, Richard talks about futures, illusions, and action.

Q: Where to begin, Richard?

A: As you know, I like to talk about action. What can we do to make the scene better? How can we change a bad direction?

Q: People appear to be infiltrated by a sense of futility.

A: Yes, and that futility stems from the idea of confronting the bigness of organizations---governments, corporations. Let's start there.

Q: Okay.

A: These organizations have their own history, you know. There is really a history of a government or a corporation, although most historians don't tackle that. But it stands to reason that, if bigness is a problem, we would want to know how that bigness got to be what it is.

Q: Why?

A: Because, if we can grasp THAT, we can begin to see that these monoliths are not just static enterprises. They came from somewhere. They were expanded by certain people, they grabbed power by certain means. What has become big can once again go back to being small. History is real. It tells how apparently unchangeable situations ALWAYS change.

Q: Bigness carries the illusion of always being big, of never losing power.

A: Yes. And we have to see that, or otherwise we just surrender.

Q: Well, I've read a lot of Gerard Colby's tome, Du Pont Dynasty, and I must say that, as great as the book is, it doesn't offer the kind of hope you want.

A: I know. That's because Colby did not choose to look at the history of that enterprise from the angle I'm talking about. He didn't start out to show how the Du Pont corporations really got to be what they are.

Q: So you are talking about a different kind of history.

A: Yes.

Q: All right, what else?

A: We have got to start with a very small unit of human enterprise.

Q: What would that be?

A: The family.

Q: What good would that do?

A: The family is a group over which every member can assert some degree of influence and power.

Q: And?

A: The family is not too big. It's something we are all familiar with. And then, building from there, you would be talking about a neighborhood. What are a neighborhood's concerns? What common issues can collect families so they're willing to sit down and talk?

Q: So families sit down and say, "What do we want? What do we need? What should we do to make the life of this neighborhood better?"

A: Right. It's not easy. There is a lot of lethargy. People want to defer to local governments. People want to say there are too many technical issues involved which they themselves can't solve. But that's something that has to be cracked.

Q: You're talking about a neighborhood association?

A: Yes, but one that really identifies issues which can change the life of those participating families for the better. Just identifying the issues can be a tough job, because people are usually looking in the wrong places. They've been conditioned to look in the wrong places.

Q: What would be a good issue?

A: Safety. The safety from harm, from crime, from unwanted incursions by criminals. In some neighborhoods, this is very real.

Q: And what is the answer to safety?

A: That's what every neighborhood group has to hammer out. It's not easy. The idea is to get a commitment from families to sit down and talk, talk a lot.

Q: Doesn't sound like an easy job.

A: Nothing is easy these days, as long as people believe that the government will take care of everything.

Q: And there is so much disagreement, once you start opening up a can of worms. For example, on the issue of vaccines---whether it's a good idea to vaccinate.

A: I know. But what's the alternative? Trying to reform the federal government in one fell swoop?

Q: Sounds like local leaders are needed.

A: Leaders are always needed. Without them, nothing gets done. People just sit around and pretend everything is okay.

Q: Can you give me an example of a local success?

A: Some years ago, in a town where I lived, a man stepped forward and started an after-school sports program for kids. It was really just a place where they could play. This man was smart and tough. He really wanted to get families to participate in their own lives, but he knew that if he just made that generic suggestion, nobody would join in. So he created a place where kids could play on their own. And parents liked the idea. A few of them volunteered to help. Some sort of spark began. A very small thing, a small piece of glue, and it began to take hold.

Q: As a way of getting families together.

A: Yes.

Q: What about money?

A: Both of us have been reading the work of Catherine Austin Fitts and her Solari group. There is a very fine idea. To get towns and villages to find out where all the money is, where it comes from, where it goes. It's about analyzing all the money that enters and flows through a town. With an eye toward developing strategies by which the people in a town can become more prosperous, instead of just being the "conduits" through which mysterious money flows like water. What a concept! Actually understanding the sources, the presence, the functions of money in a community. This a very fine spark of inspiration. Everyone is interested in money. Everyone wants more money. It's a great jumping-off point.

Q: And if one community could make a real map of money, in this way, who knows what they'd really find out?

A: Sure. Once you get real and start factoring in, say, drug money and corrupt money, you uncover all sorts of interesting stuff. You begin to flesh out the real economy, not the fake economy. You put people's noses right up against the truth. Uncomfortable? Yes. Valuable? Yes.

Q: You could take this model and stretch it out in all sorts of directions.

A: Right. Suppose some UFO researcher, in an area where lots of sightings have taken place, begins to lead others in the direction of finding out what the hell this is all about? Suppose he stimulated the natural curiosity of people who are, too often, mired in the boring details of living? He creates a new soap opera---but one which has real and unexpected consequences.

Q: He holds meetings in his house.

A: Sure, exactly. And slowly, people show up. It's exciting, it's fun, it turns out to be better than television. A lot of inertia to overcome, but in the long run, lots of good things can happen. People wake up.

Q: Tap into the curiosity of people.

A: Yes. Find an issue which gets people to think a little and dream a little and plan a little and get off the dime.

Q: But---

A: Eventually you have to find a core issue. And I think money is one of those. Because everyone wants more. Money, to most people, stands for security, mobility, safety, fun, status.

Q: So---

A: So if one---think model, think example. If ONE community or town can do an analysis, say, along the lines of the Solari pattern, and find out a lot about the money that washes through their area---and THEN, if that leads to ways of figuring out how to change those flows so everyone benefits financially, in some tangible way, you have a winner. And you also have a model which can be repeated by other communities.

Q: Okay, so let's now turn around and look at things from the macro angle. The whole nation. What can be done there?

A: Expose the grisly truth about something that everyone cares about---expose the lies that are being told by the authorities, by those everyone seems to trust---explode the whole damn thing to the skies and dig out the truth and the corruption and present it over and over again. That tends to shake people out of their lethargy. It forces them to face up to something. It's like a purgative. You may not like it at first, but it works.

Q: Some issue like 9/11, for example, and all the lies that have been told about it.

A: Yes.

Q: Foreign policy, in general, seems to be a good issue.

A: The lies there are staggering. The denial is equally staggering. You know, there are congressmen and senators who really don't see clearly that the US owns the IMF, and they don't see what our real foreign policy is. They don't see what the effect is on our domestic lives.

Q: What about getting honest and smart people elected to national office?

A: Yes. I haven't given up on that. There you need people who are in it for the very long haul. You need the same person to run again and again. For twenty years, if necessary, every two years, for a seat in the House. You need to overcome the

power of TV ads and non-issues that way. You need to dig very far into the grass roots. It's a very steep staircase.

Q: Labor intensive.

A: Right.

Q: It's a matter of mobilizing people who know a lot of truth but just sit there with it and don't know what to do about it.

A: Yes.

Q: What is the primary illusion that keeps these actions you recommend from taking place?

A: The illusion is, we don't know enough to take action. Something is missing from our knowledge. We aren't experts. We don't have the resources. But the fact is, you learn from doing. Expect failures. They're good for you. You learn by doing. You gain wisdom, and you gain a battle-hardened sense of persistence. You discover that you didn't die from the effort. You find out you're still there, still kicking, still trying. If you don't take action, you don't learn what you need to learn. You remain virgins. You begin to entertain other illusions based on the fact that you haven't jumped into the fray. Virgins are the last and worst roles we should want to play. Virgins are without a clue. We need experience in the field. We need to see what happens when we stand up and speak the truth. We need to shed all sorts of weird ideas based on nothing. It's like a boxer. What does he really know about his sport if he doesn't climb in the ring? What does he know about his own reactions? He is going to have some pretty self-destructive reactions. But from these he can learn. He can overcome his own unsuccessful reactions. He can get to the next level.

Q: As you've said before, the opposition, the cartels, are very battle tested.

A: They sure are. They have a margin for error. They can re-trench, bring up new resources, formulate new plans. They can bankrupt a company or a bank, in order to "re-distribute income." They can manipulate the trading markets---this is why it helps if we know where all the money is going. If we can follow it. The Department of Justice surely doesn't want to. You see, when you are looking at theft on such a grand and pervasive scale, it's difficult to face, especially when you [the DOJ] would have the official responsibility for facing it. Because it takes you five seconds to realize that it [the ongoing theft] involves people, so many people you don't dare touch. It's like walking into a vault and seeing all the very best people helping themselves to the gold bars and jewelry. You're stunned. And they look up and glance at you as if you're nothing.

Q: The author and investigator Donald Freed once told me he didn't really like investigating crimes because he was at a disadvantage. He didn't have the power to subpoena records, phone records, police documents, and so on.

A: Right. And neither do we. It's impossible to get all the records of bank transfers and other reports of money transfers. And that is what we're looking at here. Continuous transfers of money. All over the world.

Q: And not just from bank to bank.

A: No. We're also looking at transfers hidden behind, for example, manipulations of prices on the stock markets and commodity markets. See, this is what you get when you permit the flowering of a money system that is so complex. You get a built-in potential, at many points in the system, for the laundering and theft and transference of money.

Q: So, in effect, the money system and the credit system---

A: All these systems were created and added to, over the centuries, to provide a kind of labyrinth, like a whole network of underground caves and passages, to allow the purposeful leakage of money.

Q: And the more money that is created out of thin air---

A: The greater the opportunity for theft of it. It's a simple idea, really. The more abstract instruments of money you create and embellish, the more underground passages of theft you invent.

Q: Building block by building block.

A: Yes. If you stop a minute and think back to more primitive times, when money was more or less a series of receipts that denoted actual ownership of very specific things---and then if you move forward in time, you see a proliferation of new instruments of money added on to that simplicity. The proliferation goes on all the time. Enron was involved in that, for example. It was trading the right to buy energies in various forms. It had found a new piece of paper, a new digital entry that customers would trade, so to speak.

Q: What then happens to older hard objects of value in this modern climate?

A: Unless their price is suppressed, like gold, their value tends to go through the roof. A wonderful example is the cellars of the Vatican and all the artifacts they contain. You could not put a price on the total. It would be impossible. As collateral, it is unlimited, for all practical purposes.

Q: And if, in one fell swoop, you could dig up all the sunken ships in the world with their treasures from times past?

A: You could sell all of it for a price which would make you the owner of the planet, or its potential owner. But that seems crazy. How could that be? It's just a result of the proliferation of money. Once you start to tag these objects with a dollar value, you're through the roof.

Q: You are talking about some strange concept of market value.

A: Market value is whatever can be arranged, whatever you can get people to pay. For example, Picasso. His estate, at the time of his death, was estimated to be about \$200 million. Because he had done so many paintings and drawings and so on. Today, that \$200 million would have swelled to 5 or 10 billion. It's all a game. Not just paintings, but all objects of value. The proliferation of so much money allows you to fetch a ridiculous price for certain things. But then a backlash sets in. The market appears to be glutted. You can no longer get people, many people, to buy a particular kind of object anymore for a sky-high price. A reaction sets in. It's as if people wake up. As if a game of musical chairs is ending, and people don't want to get stuck with what they just bought. They fear they won't be able to find another buyer later on.

Q: And this means?

A: Slowly, the world of objects---which, you might say, is where money itself came into being---begins to recede. And what takes its place is the trading of money for money in its various forms. The abstraction slowly takes over.

Q: Sounds completely insane.

A: It is.

Q: But then---

A: You get an extreme focus by the super-wealthy on certain "objects" of value. Like oil. Like the ability to manipulate genes and cure illness. Even if oil is not really required anymore to fuel the planet. Even if the gene-research is, in most ways, a sham. It's all about perceived value. And it's all about the hunt for very cherished "objects" which are worth paying great sums for. I'm now talking about psychology. The collective urge to assure ourselves that things of value really have value. This urge covers over a growing insecurity about the whole subject of money---a sense that money is becoming so abstract that, by its theft alone, in which no real objects of value are traded, a person can make himself incredibly wealthy.

Q: The whole subject of neo-colonialism---

A: On one level, it's an attempt by the super-wealthy to assure themselves that the "old values"---land, slaves, minerals---that THIS is really what the whole game is all about. It's a fever for possessing things and people.

Q: And what is the counter-impulse among these super-wealthy people? What is it which makes them feel insecure?

A: First of all, the sense that money itself is becoming so much an abstraction that even they won't be able to control it all, won't be able to keep track of it all. The other great counter-impulse is the gnawing knowledge that technology has made it possible for the whole planet---every man, woman, and child---to live in comfort and

security. That makes a sham of the money game. That makes the whole idea of possessing the lion's share a ridiculous notion. If there is enough for everyone, if, as Bucky Fuller pointed out, we can do more and more with less and less [raw materials], then we have already passed the point where everyone can be afforded a basically secure, clean, and healthy life, as a birthright.

Q: In which case---

A: In which case, all the old ideas of the few dominating the many like kings and queens is a tattered remnant of an old dream. It really has no more currency. It means nothing. At this point, you get a kind of chaos spinning out from the old center, where it used to be considered an obligation of the rich to control everyone else. This chaos, as a psychological fact, leads to wilder and wilder behavior. It leads to a more insistent demand, on the part of the super-wealthy, to re-institute those old values. It leads to a denial which causes these controllers to do very dangerous things---like risk nuclear war. It leads to all sorts of unsavory behavior. I would liken this situation to a great castle, which contains all the magical recipes for "turning a little into a lot." The miracles of transmutation are all there. We can make fish from loaves, and loaves from fish, so to speak. We can provide for everyone. And as the expeditionary force of the super-wealthy enter this castle, it's as if they are infected by some subtle plague. They feel desperately uneasy. They feel things are slipping away from them. The possibilities for sheer abundance generated out of our technology are endless, and it's too much for them. They can't deal with this. It oppresses them and haunts them. They want to justify some sort of system in which they are still the center of the universe, since they know how to take care of everyone else through domination. But the need for domination is really over. And if they have no function left, even their perverted sense of "nobility," then what do they have? And if they need even more proof of their own impotence, all they have to do is look at money, the abstraction which is growing out of control on the vine, which is being expanded to take on so many instruments of itself that it is a troubling confusion. Money, more and more, seems like nothing except a person sitting at a computer recording huge bank-account entries.

Q: Yet they created this money system to allow them to steal everyone blind.

A: Yes. A case of the creation taking over the creator. It's an old myth, really.

Q: So they scramble to keep control of their creation.

A: Yes, and if that were all they had to do, I would say they'd make out all right. But there is this other current, this fact that by technology alone, we have already passed the point where we can give, as a birthright, a basically abundant life to every human on the planet.

Q: I've said this before---you're quite a bit more than a financial analyst.

A: I was forced into these other avenues of exploration, because I couldn't explain what was happening around me.



Q: Are we going to see a money crash of some kind?

A: The crash already happened, about sixty years ago. We just didn't hear it. There are different kinds of crashes, you know. You can have a crash where everyone just knows, deep down inside, that we're screwing around with money in a huge circle. On the surface, it looks like a relatively small number of people are in the circle and everyone else is on the outside. WHICH IS TRUE. But on another level, what's really happening is something else. People in power are turning somersaults to prove somehow that there is not enough of the life essentials for everyone. They keep trying to prove it. Looks like there will be a new war in Iraq to keep proving it. But they are wrong every time. Money, as we once knew it, is finished. What replaced it was grand theft on a grand scale. Money only really means something if you don't know how to give everyone a decent level of life. When that illusion vanishes, you're left with something beautiful, too beautiful for most people to face.

###END###

**November 1, 2002**

Q: What is the basic idea behind petitions?

A: In America?

Q: Yes.

A: To get your case heard, so to speak, by the government. It was conceived as a method to correct flaws in the functioning of government. It was understood by the Founders that government would, as a matter of course, try to gather to itself powers which did not belong to it.

Q: So a petition was a way to cut through red tape.

A: In a sense, yes. But not in our current situation, where red tape means years of delays and lies and postponements and so on.

Q: So citizens have no faith in petitions.

A: These days, 99.9 percent of the populace does not even know there is such a right, or that it is contained in the 1st Amendment.

Q: Not a good situation.

A: No. State governments more or less say, "If you want to get your idea made into a law, then petition by placing an initiative on the state ballot. Otherwise, don't bother us."

Q: But this is all wrong.

A: It is. Part of the essential idea of a petition is seeing the person you are petitioning, face to face. You and your government. You hand over the piece of paper with the signatures. You are there. There is real contact.

Q: So, to get the right perspective on this, we could be talking about a city government.

A: Today? Yes. A small city government. People tend to know each other, or to have friends in common. There is that pressure. The petitioner walks into City Hall and hands over the petition to someone he might know. I'm not saying all petitions can work this way, but even if we go back to the case of 1774, in America, the British King knew that some of the signatures on the petition belonged to well-known Americans. People who might know people he, the King, knew.

Q: It's not like sending a petition to a robot who works in an office on the moon.

A: No.

Q: Are petitions a dead issue these days?

A: Pretty much. Just as real citizen grand juries are a dead issue. But they can be resurrected. It can happen.

Q: What is the government's greatest fear?

A: Being made accountable to the people. If that happens, you'll get a domino effect. If taxes are acknowledged by the government as a troubling issue that needs clarification and correction and a search through historical records, to see if the 16th Amendment was ever passed, that opens a very wild doorway. What would be next? The real structure of the Federal Reserve? The federal monopoly on the practice of the "right kind" of medicine? The illegal conduct of US foreign policy, which is designed to destroy the economies of other nations?

Q: So a well-written petition---

A: A well-written petition can actually spell these issues out in great detail. It is not simply a demonstration. Or a vague protest. Which is why the concept of a real petition has been diverted into these other channels you mention. A real petition cites the problems and the laws broken.

Q: Of course, if you have a real petition and a large demonstration---

A: A good combination.

Q: My understanding is, petitions go at least as far back as ancient Rome.

A: There was case of a slave woman who petitioned the Emperor after her master was murdered. She offered to help solve the murder, and her petition was acted on. She received an imperial reply, and later on, two years later, received another imperial note which said that if she could produce proof she had, indeed, helped in the investigation, she would be freed.

Q: As you know, there is now a petition to the IRS, by We the People, a group formed to end injustice on the subject of taxation.

A: It's a very proper and crucial petition. These people are going about things in the right way. They're enacting a very detailed petition, and they're also publicizing their efforts. They're enlisting the aid of citizens everywhere in the country.

Q: Their effort has echoes of the Declarations sent to King George by the colonists.

A: Well, it's a non-violent grass roots movement. It asks for real justice, and it addresses grievances.

Q: I'd love to see the door swing open for them. For all of us.

A: These people are becoming "battle-hardened." They've been rebuffed many times, and they're not going away. That's the true test. Do you fold up, or do you stay in there.

Q: The word petition appears all over the place in the language of addressing courts. You know, to hear a motion.

A: Yes. That's also a corrupted use of the term as it appears in the 1st Amendment. See, the real and deep meaning of the word petition is a kind of last-ditch effort to make a wrong right. It was put into the Amendment as a safety valve for the people, not as a routine part of legal proceedings. An appeal to a higher court on a verdict delivered by a lower court is a kind of petition. But it's still not the thing that is placed in the 1st Amendment. At the time the Bill of Rights was written, the nation had just emerged from a war, a revolutionary war, which was based on petitions that had gone unanswered.

Q: Petitions to King George.

A: Yes. The framers knew about petitions. They had been trying to make them work, and they couldn't. They couldn't get any sort of justice from the King. Actually, the Revolutionary period was a double-headed situation. Some of the American revolutionaries were trying to gain justice. Others, who knew that King George was not so completely opposed to independence for the colonies as had been advertised, were mounting the Revolution to try to create a new and clandestine monarchy cloaked in the robes of a republic. In other words, these fake revolutionaries wanted to create themselves as the new aristocracy, the new monopolists and large landholders who would, in their wisdom, guide the new nation in an anti-republican direction. For them, it was absolutely necessary to paint the British monarchy as unalterably opposed to independence, so a war could be fought, a war which would ultimately place them---the fakes---on their new and secret thrones, hiding behind freedom. Some things never change. Nevertheless, the Constitution WAS framed and passed, and it DID establish something magnificent, something real.

Q: It occurs to me that if a grand petition were submitted to the government about this war on Iraq---

A: Along with all the opposition to the war, a petition could focus the public on exactly what objections people have. It could bring up the subject of wars for oil, for example, and the outrageous refusal to develop alternative energies. This is what a petition is supposed to do-- -FOCUS people on the specifics and charge them with a desire to see something concrete emerge.

Q: In that sense, petitions function like grand juries are supposed to work.

A: If you mean citizen participation, yes. Grand juries were built to allow citizens to go out and actually investigate suspected crimes. Grand juries were supposed to be activist enterprises. Not sideshows run by prosecutors, in which the grand jurors blindly follow where they are told to go. There is a psychology at work here. Citizens really WANT to participate in government. The Revolution of 1776 was not fought so that people could just retire from participation. People will participate intelligently, and with great spirit, if that is encouraged. But people will also quit the

job rather quickly, as soon as they see that they are not really being paid attention to.

Q: Also, as government itself becomes so complex---

A: Let me quote you some words from Thomas Paine.

Q: Any day I hear a quotation from Paine is a good day.

A: He wrote, "I draw my idea of the form of government from a principle in nature, which no art can overturn, viz. that the more simple any thing is, the less liable it is to be disordered; and the easier repaired when disordered..."

Q: In that case---

A: Petition has as one of its functions, the reduction of the complexity which creates injustice, which hides crimes. Historically, you see petitions sometimes tied to the issue of unfair taxation. That certainly was the case in the American colonies.

Q: Taxes as a form of slavery.

A: You see this going back into the mists of history. A priesthood takes over and institutes a tax, which is a form of protection racket. It's the beginning of the Mob. "We'll make sure nothing bad happens to you---like death---if you pay your tax. If you don't pay, we'll string you up by your feet." People don't realize it but, from the beginning of in-place agrarian societies, you had the tax collector.

Q: Look at the story of Joseph, in the Old Testament. The coat of many colors. He became what was essentially a tax advisor to the Pharaoh.

A: That's right. And you saw a form of petition from the people. There was famine in the land, and they wanted their leader to construct some system of relief. So Joseph advised the Pharaoh to increase taxes---first, in the form of wheat taken from the farmers and placed in storage against the day when the people were faced with even worse starvation. And that tax system escalated and became even more oppressive.

Q: So in that case, the answer to a petition was more taxation.

A: Yes.

Q: Coming forward into the so-called Dark Ages of Europe, you had the Roman Church exacting taxes of a kind from the population. And then, when more secularized governments finally came into vogue in Europe, the system of taxes---which was also a strategy of monarchies---was continued. As you say, it's a protection racket, pure and simple. Making profits on the backs of those toil for a living.

A: When the mercantile world emerged in Europe, and the middle class really came into being, governments saw that taxes could become an even better racket. It was

natural that the American colonists would petition the King to lower or eliminate taxes.

Q: It was just as predictable that the monarchy would object to a trend to cut the tax.

A: Cutting taxes is an admission by the government that it [the government] really doesn't serve that vital a function. What we now perceive as federal tax cuts is a very minor change. It's an illusion. The government does not want to shrink. It does not want to give people the idea that it could shrink.

Q: So in the case of WE THE PEOPLE---

A: We're seeing a very intelligent probe into the heart of government---"we don't think you are as necessary as you think you are"---that's what this group is saying to the government.

Q: Remember Bucky Fuller's famous statement about government?

A: He said, if governments, if politicians suddenly all disappeared, the people would be liberated. They would not be hamstrung. They would find a new way to live. A better way.

Q: Is the income tax, as a compulsory law, legal?

A: No. As you and others have written, the 16th Amendment, which set it up, was never legitimately passed. How can you have a just society when the earnings of people are taken from them? How can you even think there is justice? It's a shell game.

Q: A shell game?

A: Yes. You take earnings from people---you make them into unwilling victims---and you give that money to others whom you classify as "the real victims." It doesn't work. It's all based on a lie.

Q: It doesn't produce real self-sufficiency in the population.

A: Correct. And on top of that, the government is run in such a way that it accumulates a huge debt. Trillions of dollars. So the taxes really go toward paying the interest on that debt. It's a clever scheme. But, you see, if the government gives the right to invent money to a private consortium of banks called the Federal Reserve, then the debt is, in a sense, owed to that entity, the Fed Reserve. Which entity doesn't really need money because it INVENTS money. So taxes become something else.

Q: What is that something else?

A: A method of enervating the population. A way to exhaust the population by extracting earnings from people. It's a way of putting more and more people at financial risk, a way of pulling them closer to the brink of financial danger.

Q: And on that brink?

A: People become more pliable. They will obey. They will do whatever they're told, because they don't feel a sense of real security and independence. So they look to the government to protect them. They want a king. They want a nanny, a daddy who will say, "Everything is all right. Just go along with everything we do, and we'll make it all right for you."

Q: People then become uncritical of the government.

A: Of course. People feel that everything, at home and abroad, that the government is doing is, in a real sense, guaranteeing their security. If the US goes into Iraq and takes over the oil fields, people think they'd better keep their mouths shut, because this will be good for them.

Q: So the idea of self-sufficiency of the individual---

A: Becomes a more distant idea. An old dream that is outmoded.

Q: We're talking about collectivism.

A: Yes. And under that system, everything is made to connect with everything else.

Q: What do you mean?

A: The public feels that everything is interdependent. Nothing can be disturbed. Otherwise, the whole system of protection might come tumbling down. If there is a giant waste dump in Utah where tons of radioactive material and other toxic waste are carted and stashed, the people in that area feel they must believe in that, because their jobs are connected with that enterprise. That's just one example. But it gives you the basic mind set that sinks in. People come to rely on the government as the protector. People come to rely on the collectivist system, and so they think in ways that are strange and self-destructive, in the long run. And THIS becomes SANITY. This becomes normal. This becomes survival.

Q: It's the modern version of the old Roman Church and its control.

A: That's true. In the old days, people were taught that, in order to get to God, they had to go through the priests. They had to obey. They had to tithe. They had to confess. They had to think of themselves as sinners, as evil. And now, it's a radioactive waste dump, to extend that metaphor. People believe they must support that dump, for their own sakes. Insanity becomes re-defined as sanity. And people accept it.

Q: Yet people look around and think that things are basically okay. Things look pretty normal. Nothing is really wrong.

A: That's the illusion. And if something is perceived to be wrong, well, the authorities are on the job. If there is a sniper loose in the DC area, everyone must rely on the police. The police will eventually take care of it. You see, as we go on and on into this collectivist era, the crises that erupt, the crises that are MADE to erupt, are viewed as too big and too complex to be solved by the people. There is only one place to turn. The government. THIS IS NO ACCIDENT. This is a part of a very large plan.

Q: And the plan is?

A: To make individuals feel impotent. To make individuals feel they must rely on a higher and bigger force. To make people feel that their very freedom, such as it is, is emanating from this higher force. The government.

Q: Very subliminal.

A: And very pervasive. People want to deny that the source of their protection could also be the source of their misery. It's too unsettling. It shakes the pillars of their perception. So when a crisis occurs, the people look to some evil thing or person or group and say, "THERE. THAT'S THE PROBLEM. AND THE GOVERNMENT WILL TAKE CARE OF IT."

Q: And then---

A: And then you have the cute hook on this whole OP. If people do arise with complaints and criticism about what this collectivist system has become, these people are characterized as weird. As nutcases. As UNGRATEFUL. As out of the mainstream. And that puts the seal on the whole self-contained system. If you try to get outside the system and look at it, you are going to be called a nutcase and a potential danger to the community. See?

Q: Because collectivism is all about creating a false sense of community.

A: Right. It's all about constructing a nation where more and more people actually work for corrupt enterprises. For corrupt corporations, for a corrupt government, a corrupted military, and so on. And this is the binding glue. This is the source of money for people, more and more. And this underpinning makes people feel a loyalty to their community that rests on a base of denial and corruption. I have traveled this country from east to west and north to south, and I have observed what's going on. I've talked to people. They are, more and more, sitting on this base I'm describing, and they take refuge in their communities. They draw in their sensors more and more and they refuse to look at what's happening, at what's being built for them. They accept collectivism, they accept what is being done to protect them, and they live within that framework. They doubt their ability to live and



prosper outside that seal, that framework. If there is any trend we have to reverse, that is it.

Q: This nation---

A: This nation was created for the individual. That was the premise. That is what you see when you read the great documents of our past. The possibilities were endless. A tremendous amount of struggle was endured to make that premise stick. And it was, in sense, all based on a healthy suspicion of large organizations---like governments. With good reasons. If you really want to see the fire out of which America was born, read the work of Thomas Paine. He was the man. He was the liberator. He WAS freedom. He never stopped writing and speaking on behalf of freedom. And he was buried because he was too dangerous. He hated slavery from the moment he first saw it.

Q: Some researchers think he actually wrote the Declaration of Independence, and not Jefferson.

A: In either case, his pamphlet, Common Sense, turned the screws on the colonies and forced the revolution to proceed. The Declaration has a number of source materials, but its real fire was inspired by Common Sense. And then, when the revolutionary war was foundering, Paine wrote another magnificent work, Crisis, which was often read to the American troops in their darkest hours. Poetry of a very high order. "These are the times that try men's souls."

Q: Many years ago, I recall seeing a documentary about the isolated people called the Hunzas. They live high in the mountains of Central Asia. Every so often, citizens come to petition their "head of state" in person. He listens and rules on the spot. The entreaties to him are usually about little disputes that arise between citizens. The system appeared to work very well, and very peacefully.

A: You are essentially talking about a local government. A small number of people in the population. Many people already know each other. There is a fundamental cohesion to begin with. And the ruler must be a rather smart person, if his decisions are met with agreement. In the Constitution of the US, this general formulation was tried in the 10th Amendment. The one that said all powers not specifically granted to the federal government were reserved for the states. In those days, a state might have 150,000 people in it. Still rather large, but somewhat manageable. Now, New York City has more people, far more people than the original colonies put together. One city. In one state.

Q: So local government is the key.

A: Yes. And by local, we would mean the town, the village, the neighborhood, and we would also mean, say, a small group of lawyers who have a business doing peaceful conflict resolution for two private parties. This is where a petition has a real chance, not only of being heard, but of being acted on with wisdom. In a sort of

casual way, with common sense being the yardstick. This is the renaissance we need.

Q: But in order for this to work---

A: These small communities and groups would have to find ways of disengaging themselves from the money teat of the federal government. Because otherwise, the local community is a kind of sham. They are really taking their sustenance from the feds. The renaissance we need is decentralization. It is hard to do when the federal government and its projects reach into every community. But it can be done. Steps at a time.

###END###

**June 6, 2003**

**ABUNDANCE VERSUS SCARCITY**

Q: Richard, in the past, you and I have talked about scarcity versus abundance, but I wanted to pound on it again, because I know how important it is.

A: I agree. You've been writing about Canada on your site. That is a country with a very small population relative to its land mass. By any number of calculations, there is more than enough of everything vital to life that could go around to everyone. But obviously that is not happening.

Q: Are you talking about a government-run brand of benevolent socialism which would redistribute wealth?

A: No. Even if that were a good idea, no government in the world wants to do that.

Q: Why not?

A: Because as more and more people feel secure that they can survive, they become more independent and less interested in the government.

Q: What about Sweden and Denmark?

A: They are certainly what you would call welfare states, but I'm using the term survival in a somewhat different way.

Q: Explain.

A: Let's begin with this: in some people's lives, they find themselves hit with so many problems at once that they experience a shift in consciousness. Instead of gnawing worry, they suddenly feel liberated. I know it sounds strange, but it does happen. I'm not recommending this as social policy, I'm just pointing out that it sometimes happens. The question is, why does it happen?

Q: And what's the answer?

A: They have, whether they like it or not, an abundance of problems. Not just one or two, but twenty. And the abundance causes a breakthrough----in some people, sometimes. They suddenly feel they can win. They feel more attached to life. They stop being so afraid and so cautious.

Q: An immediate example from literature occurs to me. The books of Henry Miller.

A: No question about it. Time and time again, he reports feeling as if he's fallen through the bottom and come out into a different state of mind. He feels alive. Contrast that with people who are in a state of fixation on one or two problems and can't get a grip on life. They become more and more cautious. They break their connections to life. They refuse to plunge forward. So my point here is, even in a situation none of us would choose to experience-----a massive number of heavy and

immediate problems---the concept of abundance can have a beneficial effect. Imagine what would happen if we could find that abundance in the areas we really want to inhabit. The positive areas.

Q: Okay, I get that.

A: So what would happen if, by some miracle, the most major corporations in Canada decided to make their profits by making available, to every citizen, at affordable prices, the essentials of life. Housing, nutritious food, clothing, transport, a bit of land.

Q: That would indeed be a revolution.

A: Yes it would be. And such a course of action could, theoretically, be taken---and the corporations, in the long run, would end up making more money. And government, intrusive wasteful government, would shrink and recede.

Q: And all this could be done without surrendering the notion of free enterprise?

A: Exactly. But the world is not presently arranged in this way.

Q: Why not?

A: Because corporations and bankers and governments are going after something else. Control. Abundant survival for some, and a life of suffering for others.

Q: You told me earlier that even germs work this way.

A: Yes. Notice we usually get one fake epidemic at a time. Not two or three or 50. But I can assure you, with complete certainty, that if WHO announced there were 50 different types of outbreaks going on now, people would just give up and say the hell with it. Their fear would diminish and they would go about their lives AND discover they weren't getting sick. The whole myth of these outbreaks would be destroyed. By the abundance of [phony] outbreaks.

Q: What about guns?

A: People are sure that if more citizens had guns, the whole country would turn into a gun battle. In the long run, the country would become a much safer place.

Q: I want to get at the psychological underpinning that keeps people from embracing abundance.

A: There are many ways to look at this. The fear of loss is a place I would start. If you are dominated by the fear that you will lose something, everything, then you try to control everything you can, to keep that from happening.

Q: In that case, you are armored against abundance for all.

A: Yes. And you're fixated on impending scarcity [loss].

Q: And so with elite families on the planet---

A: Look at how much they have. They learn to believe that all of their wealth is in potential peril. Short-term. Long-term. So even though they are abundant in that sense of wealth, they are fixated on possible scarcity. That leads them to want to control everything. To prevent what they anticipate as a possible loss.

Q: You're describing an endless state of paranoia.

A: That's right.

Q: Whereas---

A: Whereas, if they decided to increase, over time, the abundance of everyone else, that would actually be their best protection against losing what they already have.

Q: But they can't see that.

A: They have already crossed the line.

Q: Meaning?

A: They have already, in their minds, made enemies of everyone else. Perhaps you remember Jonathan Kwitney's famous book, *Endless Enemies*.

Q: Which related to American foreign policy.

A: Right. In that case, Kwitney was showing how the political and economic elites of America created enemies abroad in an unending stream. Same psychology. On a collective level.

Q: Some people would claim that the whole obsession with waging wars is simply tied to the idea of making profit from both warring sides.

A: And that is true. The elite wealthy always look for ways to profit from their basic obsession. But the basic obsession is protecting what they have. War is one result of that psychology.

Q: And yet, as you say, abundance for all would be a far better strategy for the elites.

A: Yes. After enough wars are waged, the elites will be targeted, and they will fall. The recent riots at the G-8 summit in Europe are a sign.

Q: And if these elites fall, they will be replaced by other elites with the same goals.

A: Over and over, the cycle repeats. The way out of that cycle is abundance for everyone. It's the only solution.

Q: I think you're telling me something about why you quit Wall Street.

A: Sure. I saw that game as one in which the illusion of rapid money streams changing hands every day hid the real fact. More and more money was being grabbed by the market manipulators behind their fronts.

Q: It seems to me that another example of this fixation on scarcity is the concept that we on Earth are alone in the universe.

A: That has to be one of the most stupid beliefs ever held anywhere. When you begin adding up the number of galaxies, you have to assume, if you assume anything, that there must be life everywhere. And if we accepted that idea provisionally and acted on it, planet Earth would be a whole different place. With a new attitude and mindset. New goals. New optimisms.

Q: I have often cited an interview I did, in 1982, with Ted Clarke, the head of instrumentation for the Jupiter probe, at JPL in Pasadena. Clarke told me that if we really set up a long-term space program, with guts in it, there would, as a side effect, be FULL employment in the US.

A: That is exactly how the principle of abundance works. One project which assumes abundance makes other abundances come into being.

Q: This really is revolutionary. It goes against the grain.

A: Of course it is. Because everyone on Earth is mired in this scarcity psychology. To one degree or another.

Q: It takes courage to break out of it.

A: Or desperation.

Q: I think of another story I've told before. I need to look up some of the details to recall the whole thing, but this involved a Finnish or Danish sculptor who lived in Paris in the early part of the 20th century. He was starving. He eventually started boiling and eating his BOOKS. In fact, he said later, he liked the binding the best, the glue.

A: I know this. He reached a point of complete desperation, went home to his town, where he was born, and went before the town council---

Q: He said that if the council gave him a studio to live and work in, and food to eat, he would give all his sculpture, for the rest of his life, to the town.

A: Right. And the council agreed.

Q: And that town became filled with his works.

A: From total scarcity to total abundance.

Q: How do you view the current shuffling of national currencies in global money markets?

A: The first thing to remember is, the manipulators do what they want to do. They can explain their motives, lie about their motives, based on various world events which they SAY necessitate certain adjustments in the value of one currency against another. At issue right now is the protection of the US dollar. Many people say it is in big trouble. If it is, that's because the manipulators want to put a big hole in the US. Call me nuts, but I don't see a huge hit on the dollar coming all at once. The dollar could go lower against the Euro, for example, but I don't foresee, in the near future, a truly gigantic devaluation.

Q: And you make this assessment because?

A: Money manipulators generally try to weaken currencies in Western nations by degrees. The drip method.

Q: Also, wouldn't a huge sudden hit against the US dollar have a wide ripple effect?

A: Yes. Nations everywhere would be affected.

Q: All this seems to tie in with your promotion of private locally issued money.

A: It does. If people in a community begin printing their own money, they can escape, to a degree, fluctuations in the national currency.

Q: What about gold as the basis of currency? Do you favor that?

A: Only if people band together around it on a private basis. ALL money is based on trust. You can say money should be based on gold, but then you are just saying that gold is something to be trusted.

Q: And of course gold can be manipulated just like paper.

A: Right.

Q: Do you keep track, these days, of pharmaceutical companies' stocks?

A: Not really. I know some are in trouble. You have companies being hurt by the competition from generic versions of their drugs and the expiring of their own patents. You have all sorts of lawsuits claiming various drugs are toxic. You have consumer groups saying drug prices are too high. The companies are looking to find support from governments.

Q: For example, "We'll sell our super-duper drugs in Third World countries for less, but we'll actually get reimbursed for the shortfall in profits, from governments and/or international agencies. And we'll keep inventing diseases as fast as we can that require new drugs."

A: Yeah. Cipro, by Bayer, made out well.

Q: Even by conventional standards, it's not a good drug against anthrax. But government orders poured in.

A: I have sources who tell me that, in China, there are definitely people who've been injured by vaccines who are being called SARS cases.

Q: What about other kinds of chemical warfare?

A: I can tell you this. These days, you don't need anything new in the way of people getting sick to invent a new disease. You've been covering that whole scam with SARS on your site. But, if you wanted to start the ball rolling, say in a local hospital, you could introduce a little bit of chemical in the surrounding community, some fairly exotic chemical not easily detected in tests----and then once people started reporting to the hospital, you could declare an outbreak through the CDC, claim to find a virus, and you'd be off and running---if the list of symptoms was vague enough so you could declare "new cases" in several countries. You could just make it up that way, and then you could start handing out the money for companies to make the drugs for treatment. Hell, in the smallpox hoax, the US government handed out huge contracts for vaccines, based on nothing.

Q: Do you think the medical cartel wanted to keep SARS fairly small and tight and contained, in terms of where they were saying it traveled?

A: I do. This was an experiment. To gauge public reaction, press coverage, the ability of a small number of labs to dominate the fake research on the virus, to gauge the cooperation of governments, the power of WHO, and so on. There will be very secret task force reports on the whole op, and these reports will be digested, to learn about how to do it next time. And not to be forgotten: think about what a tremendous boost the whole idea of disease germs in general has gotten from the SARS scam.

Q: You and I and Ellis Medavoy have been predicting these medical ops for a long time.

A: It's here. Now.

Q: At what point does the public fail to respond to these phony outbreaks or even rebel?

A: That is definitely a consideration. The disease manipulators are pondering that. This isn't like NFL football. You can't get people coming back every Sunday. I think one favored shot will be jungles and rainforests---they'll capitalize on all the PR about these far-off spots being incubators of exotic disease. People will buy a new outbreak from a rainforest. We've been set up for that. And environmentalists will jump on the bandwagon. They'll say this proves that civilization must be cut back and the outbreak would never have happened if we had stopped advancing into these pristine areas.

Q: Right. Of course, environmentalists are accurate in pointing out various ways that giant corporations are eating up and fouling land on the planet.



A: Yes, but in the long run, as more and more land is “set aside,” to “protect it,” who will benefit? Those same corporations, whose smaller competition has been edged out by the land grabs. And people will be forced, more and more, into unlivable cities. Making them better targets for depopulation.

Q: Agencies and groups which have an agenda or an assigned mission WILL discover what they are programmed to deal with---even if what they discover is not there at all. It's like a self-replicating fungus.

A: For instance, virus hunters will find viruses that cause new disease, although, in truth, they've found no viruses and the diseases have been around for thousands of years. And some environmentalists will “discover” all sorts of terrible diseases in rainforests that are working their way out into the West---when that is really not the case. But we can easily take this a step further. There is a man named John Orr, one of the most respected arson investigators in the country. He used to work for the Glendale, California, Fire Department. Well, not too long ago, it was discovered that he had set a number of major fires up and down the California coast, during a ten-year period. In one case, a forest fire, he came to the scene while investigators were looking for the point of origin---the fire was still burning. Orr took them right to the spot where it started. The other investigators thought he was a genius. He is now in prison for life. Some of the people who caught him suspect he set hundreds of fires over the years. Hundreds.

###END###

**December 28, 2003**

AN INTERVIEW WITH RICHARD BELL ON CARTELS OWNING NATURAL HEALTH COMPANIES.

Richard has some brief remarks to make on the cartelization trends in this world of ours.

Q: Here is a list. It tells something about the chain of ownership of two natural health companies, CASCADIAN FARMS and MUIR GLEN. These companies are known for their sales of organic products. They are both owned by SMALL PLANET FOODS.

A: Yes, I know. And SMALL PLANET is owned by GENERAL MILLS, a huge commercial food processor.

Q: That's right. And here are some of major investors in GENERAL MILLS: PHILIP MORRIS, EXXONMOBIL, CHEVRON, NIKE, MCDONALD'S, TARGET, STARBUCKS, MONSANTO, DU PONT, DOW, PEPSICO, ALCOA, DISNEY, TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, PFIZER.

A: Okay, let's look at a few of these investors. Dow, Du Pont, and Monsanto are three of the biggest chemical companies around, as far as toxic products are concerned. Pfizer is a giant drug company. So...we are looking at a situation where ultimate control of the natural health companies falls into the hands of Toxic Central.

Q: Hidden behind a wall of semi-secrecy.

A: Yes.

Q: Even Nike is in on this.

A: Of course.

Q: What do you mean, of course?

A: What you are looking at here is a microcosm of the way giant corporations do business.

Q: What do you mean?

A: They invest in other companies. In this case, they are all investing in General Mills. So you are looking at a pattern.

Q: A pattern of what?

A: Of cross ownership, of interlocking ownership. The big boys own each other. These companies do not simply make products. They INVEST in other companies.

Q: And what is the trend here?

A: A constant shuffling and reshuffling of ownership based on investments in the stocks of these companies. Over time, you get a shakeout effect.

Q: What is that?

A: Certain major players end up owning more and more of very large companies which in turn own smaller companies. You get “a rising of the cream to the top.”

Q: Give me an example of a corporation that is very much CREAM.

A: Citicorp.

Q: A giant among giants.

A: Yes.

Q: So the trend isn't just naked takeovers.

A: It is that, but it is this other thing. Ownership of the stock of companies---not all the stock but a lot of it.

Q: And in the end?

A: More and more ownership of the overall means of production in fewer and fewer hands.

Q: And finally? Just one corporation?

A: I assume that's a joke. The idea is to CONCEAL. Not to step out into the sun and say, “I own everything.” So you construct more and more fronts of fronts, and you get de facto ownership behind these fronts. It's like the board game, Monopoly, but with a few important differences. The players who are rolling the dice and building hotels on properties are secret. They appoint fronts of fronts to roll the dice for them.

Q: This is an evolving situation.

A: Absolutely.

Q: Okay. So let's take a very powerful---perhaps the most powerful---secret society, THE JESUITS. Where do they fit into this process?

A: A very good question. The Jesuits mainly operate at a level above all of this. They infiltrate these giant owning forces much in the same way that a king would find himself surrounded by “advisors” who have a secret agenda. They influence the king. They provide slanted information and projects and directions. They target men who are at the top of the heap and they become advisors and planners and so on.

Q: And what direction are the Jesuits focusing on?

A: The creation of a greater and greater divide between the rich and the poor.

Q: Because?

A: Because the Jesuits know that as this polarization is made more intense, there will be more chaos generally. More suffering, more breakdown of morale, more resentment, more difficulty in maintaining a "modern way of life."

Q: More of a return to more primitive times, in which the Church has always flourished.

A: Precisely. Modern industrial life is considered an enemy by the inner core of the Church.

Q: But in the case of a return to more primitive times, the giant corporations will eventually see their consumer base shrink not expand.

A: Yes. The Jesuit agenda is not to help the corporations, but to use them to create more chaos.

Q: How aware are the corporate giants?

A: They basically know they have a long-term problem, but they define it as NOT ENOUGH PURCHASING CONSUMERS. And they tend to stop there. They don't see they are being worked by this other force. The Jesuits don't have to do all that much to get things moving in the direction they favor---because the corporations are already heading that way. The main thing the Jesuits do is keep the corporations from solving the problem, from expanding the consumer base, from making people more self-sufficient everywhere.

Q: Are you saying there is a built-in flaw in capitalism?

A: No. There is a built-in flaw when capitalists cheat and opt for control of the market through illegal acts. Then you get a curve.

Q: A curve?

A: Yes. For awhile, prosperity increases over a general area. But eventually that curve heads down, because the cartelization effect destroys the market and then more and more people become less able to make a good living.

Q: The Jesuits see this.

A: Of course. They simply push cartelization along in the direction it's heading.

###END###

## **November 17, 2004**

We start with this news article and then Richard comments on it:

New Plan Virtually Eliminates US/Mexico/Canada Borders

Meet NAFTA On Steroids

© 2004 WorldNetDaily.com

11-17-2004

WASHINGTON - North American national borders would be virtually eliminated under plans being considered by senior business and political leaders from Canada, the United States and Mexico for a "NAFTA-plus," continent-wide, customs-free zone with a common approach to trade, energy, immigration, law enforcement and security.

A tri-national task force, chaired by former Liberal Party deputy prime minister John Manley, with the full backing of all three governments, is plotting the roadmap for this new, bolder alliance meant to compete with the European Union.

William Weld, former governor of Massachusetts and Pedro Aspe, former Mexican finance minister, join Manley on the panel that reports directly to the Council on Foreign Relations.

The mission has the formal blessing of Tom Ridge, U.S. Homeland Security secretary, who is close with President Bush.

The committee is scheduled to issue its report next spring. The elimination of borders along the lines of the EU experiment seems to be high on the agenda of the panel. "I think we've had 11 years of incrementalism, and during that time we've seen the EU expand its borders, eliminate borders among (member) countries and launch a common currency," explains Manley in the diplomatic magazine Embassy. "We're going to have to provide a vision that is more bold than incrementalism. What's the choice? Europe has made enormous steps in the years since NAFTA was signed. China has been going through a transformative process. In Canada, our only leverage is access to the U.S. market. If we're not going to develop and pursue how we use our advantage of location to be the foundation for future prosperity, then we are going to have to figure out another vision."

The "NAFTA-plus" plan has also been referred to as "deep integration." Skeptics see it as a plan to eliminate national sovereignty and erode the American concept of representative government accountable to the people under the framework of the Constitution.

Discussions so far indicate that Canada, under the new agreement, would immediately sign on to the U.S. strategic missile defense initiative. Canada would also make its vast lumber resources available to the U.S. and Mexican markets and

provide more open access to the northern neighbor's oil, natural gas and hydro-electric power resources.

Other members of the task force include: Canadian Finance Minister Michael Wilson and Nelson Cunningham of Henry Kissinger's consulting firm, Kissinger McLarty Associates.

[http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=41447](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=41447)

My comments:

This tells you why Bush has been so lite on illegal immigration from Mexico, why he has refused to enforce the law, and why he has granted a very wide amnesty to illegal immigrants already inside the US.

He is well aware of the brewing plan to integrate the three nations in an EU-style set-up.

Now, imagine that over the last thirty years, there had been strict and successful enforcement of immigration laws regarding Mexico. In that case, there would be no "logical" reason to follow this new plan.

However, because "there has been no way to limit illegal immigration from Mexico," the new plan becomes a fait accompli.

"Hey, there is no other way. We may as well admit we've lost the immigration laws and do the strategic thing---erase the borders between Mexico, the US, and Canada."

In other words, this new plan is the end-game in a long project to merge the US with its northern and southern neighbors.

As you can see, it will all be floated under the aegis of "economic advantage" to the three nations.

Remember, that was how the EU was started: as the Common Market, which was a Bilderberger Group plan. All along, the idea was to integrate Europe under a single constitution and ruling elite.

And they did it, step by step. It took about 50 years. They had the plan, the clout, and the patience. Two steps forward, one step back. Not a problem for them.

The same project is on the boards for Canada, the US, and Mexico.

It doesn't take a genius to figure out that America will bear the brunt of the burden, if this end-game takes shape in reality.

Social services will absorb a major hit.

American businesses will be able to hire workers from Mexico in even greater numbers, at the lowest possible salaries. Putting more American workers out of jobs.

By any definition of Common Culture, the English language will take a further back seat. The political fallout? As basic literacy continues to decline, whatever now passes for public debate on important issues will fracture to an even greater degree and become less coherent.

Looking deeper: for decades, major political shadow-heavy-hitters inside the US have been enacting a squeeze play on Mexico by supporting what amounts to a fascist government in Mexico. This has caused untold numbers of Mexicans to look to the US as a haven. Hence, greater and greater illegal immigration for the US.

Hence, the APPEARANCE of the impossibility of stemming the flow of people coming across the border. Hence, the "only sensible solution"---erase the borders altogether.

That squeeze play, as it turns out, was also worked on America. With full and conscious intentionality.

As I have tirelessly reported, every US president for the past 40 years has signed on to a few planks in a secret platform. It mattered not what party the president represented. Free trade was one of those planks. Another one is the gradual merging of nations. When Richard Nixon (despite all his faults and his crimes) balked momentarily at following the simple script, he was blasted out of the White House through a multi-layered op.

When you erase national borders, you basically say, "These nations are no longer separate and distinct and sovereign. They are One."

Of course, the gradual implementation of the end-game requires, more and more, a complacent and passive and impaired population. We can view the blueprint for this aspect in the Bush plan to screen every American child for mental illnesses, starting at age three. I'm talking about diagnosis on a scale never before seen---and the drugs to go with it. The drugs decimate the capacity for independence.

Here is the conversation with Richard Bell.

Q: What do you think of this new plan to merge the three countries?

A: It doesn't surprise me at all. Part of the op called the war on Iraq is aimed at reducing the financial viability of the US. Thus making the "economic interdependence" of the US, Canada, and Mexico seem like a more practical idea.

Q: Who benefits?

A: The largest banking and corporate groups would be right up there.

Q: They already have no national loyalties.

A: Correct.

Q: What about the Rockefeller constellation?

A: They are some of the biggest movers and shakers behind this whole merging plan. The kernel of the idea is to turn the planet into a machine. A well-oiled machine.

Q: They don't expect this triple merger of nations to go through without a hitch.

A: Of course not. But they will try to manage and control the opposition. By creating it.

Q: For example.

A: Suppose some group emerges that says the merger will be bad for Mexico. And their argument gets wide press. Then the argument is shot down. Ditto for Canada. Or you could get something like this. A fake terrorist incident is staged. Some "al Qaeda" people come into the US from Mexico with a bomb and set it off. Then, in the aftermath, we "discover" that by erasing the border altogether, we can "actually screen people from Mexico more thoroughly." Anyone can come over IF they submit to deep checks and close searches and all sorts of invasions of their privacy at the border. The old system failed, but under the new system, all of a sudden, everything is pronounced A-OK. Mexico is suddenly compliant, doesn't resist. As long as the border is open, Mexico will allow massive screening. Of course, the whole thing is a sham.

###END###



**January 6, 2006**

RICHARD BELL ON PAT ROBERTSON

Q: You read Robertson's remarks about Sharon and Israel?

A: Sure. Robertson is really something.

Q: What's going on here?

A: Basically, Robertson believes---or claims to believe---that when Israel has expanded to its "correct" size, one of the conditions of the end times prophecy will be met. Which means the world is one step closer to Armageddon and the 1000-year return of Jesus.

Q: So Sharon was what? An enemy of the prophecy?

A: Right. Robertson sees Sharon's attempts to cede territory back to the Palestinians as a retreat from the necessary expanded Israel. Therefore, Robertson said, God had brought on Sharon's stroke, as punishment.

Q: Some dude.

A: Yeah. But it gets worse. Robertson and many other end-times believers see peace on Earth as the sole job of Jesus.

Q: Meaning?

A: They believe that there will be catastrophic world war, and this is good. It's good because it's one of the steps on the way to Jesus returning to Earth. All the people who don't accept Jesus as their savior will be sucked up in the war---and then Jesus will come back.

Q: Therefore?

A: Therefore, on two counts, it is a crime to seek peace on Earth. You see? One, only Jesus brings peace. Two, there will be a global war of immense destruction first. So if any human being tries to accomplish peace, he is going against the current of war prophecy and he is going against the dictum that only Jesus brings peace.

Q: It's a crime to seek peace "prematurely."

A: Yes. You can find this idea reflected all over the place in end-times thinking. Expanding war anywhere is actually welcomed as a sign that events---eventually leading to Jesus' peace of a 1000 years---are on track with God's plan.

Q: The war in Iraq---

A: The end-timers view it as a step toward the ultimate goal. So they have no problem with it.

Q: What about the curious embrace of certain end-times Christians and militant hard-line Jews in Israel?

A: On the one hand, these end-timers support those Jews who favor the expansion of Israel's territory. You know, as fulfillment of prophecy. On the other hand, when the war comes, when Armageddon comes, the end-timers shrug and say that those Jews who don't convert to a belief in Jesus will be drowned in the war and forsaken by God.

Q: Talk about cultural thought forms.

A: Really.

###END###

**February 20, 2006**

Q: Richard, what do you think of the current idea that a shift in petrodollar trading from dollars to euros is a major problem?

A: It might be, but in general you have to realize that deals are made to solve problems. This is the more important context. At various times and places, there are money crunches, and the bankers and governments work it out.

Q: In these deals, there are winners and losers.

A: The winners are the elites who want to consolidate and build larger allied political structures.

Q: Can you give me an example?

A: Sure. Take the situation you just mentioned. Who are the two sides? The US and the European Union [EU]. Dollar versus euro. But these are also two political structures of enormous power. To broker a deal between them means you are CONSOLIDATING them in certain ways. Which, you see, is the whole point of the conflict in the first place. Bring two forces into collision WITH THE AIM OF EVENTUALLY RESOLVING THEIR ANIMOSITY BY DRAWING THEM CLOSER TOGETHER IN A DEAL. In that manner, you get an even larger and more unified structure: EU plus US.

Q: In that case, the real winners are the elite that stands above and behind both the EU and the US.

A: The globalists. Yes. That's the point. That's what I'm saying.

Q: So the conflict is encouraged from above, and then you get the resolution.

A: Right. The overall global situation these days is all about consolidation. Building bigger and bigger and more unified political structures. To do that, you need competition, so you can build up all sides in strength and power, and THEN glue them together.

Q: In a sense, then, the conflict phase is artificial.

A: Yes. It's very real on one level, because the "warring parties" are definitely bent on competing with each other. But on a higher level, this is anticipated and encouraged---so that each side becomes more powerful and bigger in the process---and THEN, when the deal is made that ends the conflict, you have a unity that consists of a gargantuan structure made up of the previously warring parties.

Q: It occurs to me that, with all the investment in US companies and stocks and assets and property coming from outside the US---

A: It limits what the US can do unilaterally. That's correct. Because, if the US government decides to take action against a nation that is heavily invested in the US,

that nation can threaten to take its money out of the US. The Saudis are a good example. You see, for centuries an international web of investments has been building up that consists of money from a number of countries. And those monies are invested all over the world. You get this interdependence---which is exactly what the money masters want. What we call globalism now has been on the march for a long time. BUILD A WHOLE PLANET THAT IS TIED TOGETHER BY MONEY---AND THEN THE POLITICAL UNITY WILL COME.

Q: Whereas, if the US had pursued a course of complete self-sufficiency from the beginning of its history---

A: Everything might be different. Would be different. When Washington, in his Farewell Address to the nation, spoke of entangling alliances and the need to avoid them, he knew what he was talking about.

Q: This is now called isolationism.

A: Why? Because they needed a very "bad word" they could use as a propaganda wave to discredit the whole idea of real independence.

Q: What we need now---

A: Is many individuals and small groups setting up their own ways of decentralizing power away from the huge elite groups---by taking chunks of that power back to themselves. Their own money, their own energy, their own communities. Step by step.

###END###

## July 2011

### RICHARD BELL ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

Q: In the current tug of war over raising the debt ceiling of the federal government, obvious questions are being avoided.

A: (laughs) Let's suppose a child is given an allowance by his tolerant parents. From time to time, the child requests and insists he be granted a raise. The parents cooperate. Finally, they say to their son, after his most recent demand, "We can't do it anymore. We don't have enough money."

"Nonsense," says the son. "Take out a loan."

And so the parents do.

Seeing his strategy works, the son escalates his requirements. And, indeed, the parents fall in line. They go deeper and deeper in debt, until no one will lend them more money. They're tapped out.

That's where the story comes to a crashing climax.

However, in the case of the federal government, because it has the power to invent money, to "print it," debt—the word, the idea—acquires a new meaning. It no longer seems to have a limit.

Of course, looking closer at this bewildering notion of debt, there do appear to be real-world consequences. It's not all print-and-print [money]. There are creditors. There is government paper which is purchased. And there are credit-rating agencies, which issue assessments of the financial viability of the government. Negative ratings immediately impact the stock market and the ability to find new creditors.

Q: So the question arises: AT WHAT POINT DOES THE US GOVERNMENT DEBT BECOME PRAGMATICALLY UNSUSTAINABLE?

A: However, in this and other debt wrangles involving Congress and the White House, that question is rarely asked. It is certainly never answered.

Q: Even though logic would dictate that an answer is required, it's not forthcoming.

A: Is the upper-upper limit of debt \$100 trillion? \$50 trillion? \$40 trillion? Less? More? Where do we stop and draw the line? One problem is: many people, many interests act like the son who wants allowance increases from his parents. The son doesn't care how much money his parents have, or what they have to do to get more. Because he, the son, has "needs." And needs come first. This has been a major feature of the operational definition of debt: how deep you go into the hole is purely a function of Need. Need trumps all. *It essentially creates money.* I'm not just talking about welfare checks or Social Security checks. I'm talking about the military

budget and the budget for education and the total of salaries for federal employees. I'm talking about the whole shooting match. I'm talking about people who are really in dire straits and people who just want what they want.

Q: Everybody has needs. Everybody wants to stand at the head of the line.

A: On the federal level, legislation of one kind or another to create and maintain a balanced budget has been tried. It's never succeeded. The debt grows, because "needs grow." In fact, a surprising number of people—although they'd never admit it publicly—believe that money itself should be an infinite machine that works solely on the basis of satisfying perceived need. They believe the definition of both debt AND money should be changed.

Q: One could say that governments like Greece have tried that radical innovation, and they've found themselves in a well without a rope or a ladder.

A: How many pundits have you heard expressing outrage that one need or another cannot be met unless the US debt ceiling is raised? Do you think they are about to answer your basic question, AT WHAT POINT DOES GOVERNMENT DEBT BECOME UNSUSTAINABLE?

Q: Is a bear about to grow wings and fly to Mars?

A: So this change of definition is in the cards. Money and debt will become new shiny words that far outstrip the old dusty meanings. In which case, we will have a new money system in the world. And, cleverly concealed behind a welter of disguises and distractions and technical mumbo-jumbo, there will be at least a partial erasure of governments' debts. Unsustainable debt is a planned crisis, long in the making, designed to spark and justify "absolutely necessary" moves toward a new global money system. And some of these planners are people who have managed to funnel/steal major money out of government coffers. Consider this question, as the election season approaches in America. If a candidate appeared on the scene, and said, "Look, we all have needs, everybody needs something, but if we add up all those requirements, we discover the national government would go broke satisfying them, and therefore, we must decide what the *final upper number* is in the debt parade"---would such a candidate stand a chance of winning the presidency, or would he be swept under a raging tide of GIVE ME WHAT I WANT NOW? When I was a child, I used to play the board game, Monopoly. I loved it. As an adult, I sat down one night at a party and played with a few friends and strangers. As we were approaching the climax and one of the men was tapping out, he turned to me and said, "You've got a bunch of hotels. Give me something so I can stay in the game."

I laughed. I had never heard of such a thing.

He stared at me with real hatred in his eyes. A kind of entitled hatred.

He snarled, threw down his Monopoly piece on the board, stood up, and walked off to the kitchen to make himself a drink.

Good thing he wasn't packing heat. Who knows what might have happened.

###END###

## October 2011

### MATRIX PSYCHOLOGY – THE CONTROL GAME

In this interview Richard expands his view of global affairs with astonishing perspective, using the arena of energy as his jumping-off point.

Q: So Richard, you wanted to talk about control.

A: Specifically, the control game and how it is played.

Q: Played by whom?

A: By the people who control it. (laughs) In the energy field, what we are seeing is the attempt to push up the price of oil to higher and higher levels. This is done in jumps and spurts, with retreats, but the trend is up. For example, as I've told you before, if the price of oil is shoved up high enough, then solar and wind energy systems appear to be cost-effective. This is intentional. Of course, the problem is--

Q: Solar and wind technology can't even begin to replace oil right now.

A: Right. There isn't enough of it. So while it might be rigged as cost-effective, huge numbers of people all over the world would have less access to energy, and the numbers of the poor would increase.

Q: You think that's intentional?

A: Of course. The people who run the game aren't stupid. They know that. They know they'd be consigning many, many people to illness and death.

Q: How does the control factor work?

A: It's a kind of triangle. You have oil and coal, the old reliable modes of energy. That's the orthodoxy. Then you have the so-called solution to the problems created on several fronts by oil and coal. The solution is wind, solar, conservation, rationing, geothermal, nuclear [with its safety problems], and so on. The solution doesn't work across the board. It only works to give the "kings" more money and more power over populations. And the third part of the triangle is the solution that could actually work. In this case, that would be all the energy inventions that have been suppressed. Two that spring to mind are Tesla, and water turbines of different kinds. There are more. Some are in earlier stages of development. But real solutions are not favored by the controllers for obvious reasons. They [the controllers] would lose control, if cheap reliable energy were available to the whole population of Earth. And control is their goal. They must keep control. I'm only talking about energy because I want to show you this triangle that applies in any control game. The orthodoxy, which is the old mode, the old way of doing things. The solution that doesn't really work but allows the controllers to increase their wealth and power, and the actual solutions, which would split open the control and destroy it and end the game.



Q: So you're saying this triangle applies very widely.

A: Yes.

Q: Can you give me another example?

A: Sure. Think US prisons in the early 1960s. There was a push on to build new prisons to house inmates, to expand the old system. Warehouse prisoners, let them go at the end of their sentences, and then watch as they commit more crime and go back into the prison system. The recidivism rate in one Massachusetts prison at the time was 70 percent. So that's the orthodoxy.

Q: What was the half-baked solution?

A: Oh, a bit of counseling, the probation apparatus, a bit of job training, basketball courts, and so on. Lots of academic and bureaucratic shuffling around, study groups, papers, reports, psychologists. It wasn't really working, but it gave people jobs, it brought more money into the prisons, it allowed the building of bigger prisons—more money and control for the people who ran the prison systems.

Q: And there was a real solution?

A: A couple of them. One occurred later, which was nutritional research, which suggested that prisoners, criminals were suffering from deficits of certain nutrients [minerals], and if those nutrients were supplied, the prisoners changed for the better. The even more radical solution was introduced from Harvard, to a Massachusetts prison in 1961, by Timothy Leary and his group of colleagues and grad students. They ran a pilot program, which involved administering psilocybin to small groups of hardcore men. You can read about it in Leary's autobiography, *Flashbacks*. The results were very promising. Extraordinary. Wholesale personality changes in the men after one session, three sessions. When Leary was fired from Harvard, the prisoners themselves, after their release, maintained a group for 15 years.

Q: But of course...

A: That solution would have created, in the long run, if it had been applied by smart caring people, across the US prison system—it would have resulted in a drastically reduced recidivism rate—fewer prisoners. The control game would have been gutted. The control factor would have been drastically reduced.

Q: There is always a third corner of the triangle in any control game?

A: I've found that to be so, yes. There is always a radical solution to a major problem, and the solution really works, and it blows up the control and the control game. So it has to be discredited.

Q: Any corollaries to this?

A: Sure. I'll give you one. If major media are supporting a particular solution to a problem, the solution won't work. And sometimes the solution is put there in the first place so it won't work, so it will operate as a diversion. If major media are supporting a solution, it isn't the third corner of the triangle. Does that tell you anything about the Occupy movements? Right from the beginning, when there were six kids in a tent down on Wall Street, you had extraordinary media coverage, and the coverage was positive. And that coverage was sufficient to stimulate other Occupy protests and encampments. Hell, I could give you ten examples, right off the top of my head, where you had, say, a little protest about something—and the protest was offering a real solution to a problem, and the media didn't cover it. But here, with six kids in a tent, you had big-time coverage and support.

Q: The conclusion?

A: Nothing definitive or good for the human race is going to come out of the Occupy movements. They're already co-opted, and they'll be steered into the overall globalist agenda.

Q: Well, in the case of the 2009 Swine Flu, we had something similar. In the spring of 2009, with only 20 cases of so-called Swine Flu, the World Health Organization [WHO] declared it a level-6 pandemic that was threatening the whole human race.

A: Yes. And the media immediately jumped in and supported all the pronouncements of the WHO. No reporter said, "Wait, how many cases have you diagnosed? A million?" "No. Twenty." (laughs) You see? It's ridiculous. But that media support told you that WHO had no real solution. It was a phony solution—and in this case, there was no real problem to begin with. Whenever major media back a solution to a problem, the solution isn't that third corner of the triangle. It isn't going to lead to real change.

Q: This is psychological warfare.

A: That's right.

Q: You applied your triangle when you were trading on Wall Street?

A: I did, in certain selective cases. I could tell, at times, when the price of oil was going to go up. That's an example. I could tell, because I could see other players trying to position solar, for instance, as a good solution. So I estimated that oil was going to go up. And it did. I made a short-term play. Because I knew that the chart on oil prices is up, down, up, down. I got in, I got out.

Q: The whole area of health is certainly a good illustration of the triangle.

A: Sure. You have illness and disease. That's the problem. The orthodoxy is the modern medical system, that apparatus in all its glory. Then you have the real solution. Prevention of illness—and all that that implies. Nutrition, and so forth. But the controllers don't want that, obviously, because then you get fewer patients.

They need an ever-increasing flow of patients to put into their system. So they offer a tsunami of answers and solutions, which are mostly PR.

Q: We're making astounding breakthroughs in genetics. We're conquering the mysteries of the brain.

A: Yes. Same kind of triangle. And of course they try to co-opt the prevention solution by multiplying the number of vaccines kids have to take. That's their phony version of prevention. They're multiplying the number of vaccines all the time because they want to monopolize prevention and eliminate their strongest competitor—natural health.

Q: In the mid-1970s, there was rapidly growing sentiment in this country about space travel, getting out into space, the next big frontier.

A: I remember. But if that passion had been pushed like crazy, the controllers would have been in trouble. For one thing, you would have had gigantic projects of all kinds, and there was the possibility you could have had nearly full employment in the country. I mean, if you really pushed it. And people would have been so excited...the frontier spirit might have returned. Decentralization of power. So the phony solution was the Shuttle. And downsizing the space budget. And the federal government and the media talking about how we needed to use all that money to solve our problems here at home. Well, look around you now. How did that work out?

Q: Can you go into the psychology of the triangle a little more?

A: It's operant conditioning. The population, over the course of decades, becomes used to the application of solutions that don't work, or solutions that only give small results. So in their minds, solutions=things that don't work or only work a little. They gradually forget there was ever a time when people did break through with radical solutions. And they forget that, at those times, it was individuals who broke through. Now they think every solution has to go through a funnel into a structure, into a centralized control point. If you think about this, you'll see it's true. This operant conditioning is a major part of the control game. The media play their role in it, too, by attacking every good solution that comes from an independent individual acting outside the system. You see this time and time again. More conditioning. The theme is: no independent individual can ever come up with a real solution, unless he is attached to a group that is part of a large structure. If he isn't, he's wrong, he's probably a phony, he may be a criminal. And when you go inside any large structure, corporate or government, you find the thinking that says: all workable solutions must come from us.

Q: Which is why people love to watch movies that have a lone hero who overcomes great odds and solves a problem.

A: People never entirely forget the truth. They need to be reminded of it, and they know it. So they find it in movies. It's like food to a starving person.

Q: Orthodoxy. Phony solution. Real solution.

A: That's the triangle.

###END###